63 Periodicals
Royal

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON
LIBRARY

23 JUL 1979

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/royal-historical-society-london-england-transactions_1959_9

TRANSACTIONS OF THE
ROYAL HISTORICAL SOCIETY

FIFTH SERIES
VOLUME 9

LONDON
OFFICES OF THE ROYAL HISTORICAL SOCIETY
96 CHEYNE WALK, S.W.10
1959

SHL
WITHDRAWN
LONDON

SHL
WITHDRAWN
LONDIN.
UNIV

Made and Printed in Great Britain by Butler & Tanner Ltd., Frome and London

CONTENTS

	PAGE
The English Farmers of the Customs, 1343–51. By E. B. FRYDE, M.A., D.Phil., F.R.Hist.S.	1
Rank and Emolument in the British Diplomatic Service, 1689–1789. By Professor D. B. HORN, D.Litt., F.R.Hist.S.	19
The Social Origins and Provenance of the English Bishops during the Reign of Edward II. By Kathleen EDWARDS, Ph.D., F.R.Hist.S.	51
The Other Face of Mercantilism. By CHARLES WILSON, M.A.	81
County Politics and a Puritan Cause Célèbre: Somerset Churchales, 1633. (*The Alexander Prize Essay.*) By THOMAS G. BARNES, A.B., D.Phil.	103
Commerce in the Dark Ages: A Critique of the Evidence. By PHILIP GRIERSON, M.A., F.R.Hist.S.	123
People and Government in Southern Asia. By HUGH TINKER, Ph.D.	141
Presidential Address: Great Historical Enterprises. II. The Maurists. By Professor the Rev. M. D. KNOWLES, Litt.D., D.Litt., F.B.A., F.S.A., F.R.Hist.S.	169
Report of Council, Session 1957–58	189
Alexander Prize	198
David Berry Prize	200
Officers and Council, 1958	201
List of Publications	i

TRANSACTIONS OF THE
ROYAL HISTORICAL SOCIETY

THE ENGLISH FARMERS OF THE CUSTOMS, 1343–51

By E. B. Fryde, M.A., D.Phil., F.R.Hist.S.

READ 11 JANUARY 1958

THE story of the English farmers of the customs has hitherto concerned historians mainly because of its bearing on the history of the House of Commons. By their control over the customs and through the influence they exerted over the other English merchants, these financiers obstructed the efforts of the commons to establish parliamentary control over indirect taxation. The nature of this challenge has been clearly explained by George Unwin and Eileen Power.[1] Edward III wished to finance the war with France by levying a heavy subsidy on exported wool (ultimately 40s. per sack) over and above the traditional light duty of 6s. 8d. per sack. The subsidy was disliked by the producers of wool, because they were convinced that it pushed down the price of wool in England. The commons who voiced this opposition were, however, powerless to prevent the collection of the subsidy as long as the wool merchants were willing to sanction its continuance and as long as the king could find English business men who would make satisfactory advances on the security of this revenue. Unwin has discussed in detail one set of developments that gradually ended this challenge to parliamentary control over indirect taxation. He was able to show how the leading financiers, by their selfish behaviour, destroyed the unity of the English wool merchants, made impossible further concerted action by merchant assemblies and forced the majority of the merchants to act in future 'with and through the

[1] G. Unwin, 'The Estate of Merchants, 1336–1365', in *Finance and Trade under Edward III*, ed. G. Unwin (Manchester, 1918), pp. 179–255; E. Power, *The Wool Trade in English Medieval History* (Oxford, 1941). The subject is also discussed by B. Wilkinson, *Studies in the Constitutional History of the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries* (2nd ed., Manchester, 1952), pp. 55–81.

commons'.[1] I want here to follow another, parallel trail. While Unwin has shown why the king could no more use merchant assemblies, I shall try to explain why and how the farmers of the customs likewise disappeared after a dramatic but brief career.

I

In exploring the history of the farmers I shall wish to draw special attention to four features. There were some serious elements of weakness in their financial position. There was a marked tendency towards the development of narrow monopolies and this caused much rivalry among the leading merchants. The normal functioning of the farm was complicated by a wave of speculation in royal letters obligatory and wardrobe debentures that ultimately did much harm to many of the participants. Lastly, for those and other reasons, the farmers of the customs became intensely unpopular.

In the thirteen-forties Edward III had to rely mainly on English financiers. This was a new experience for the royal government. Earlier on, for nearly seventy years, from the accession of Edward I to 1340, a succession of major Italian firms had almost continuously lent money to the English crown. Edward III had exhausted the resources of his ordinary financiers during the first campaigns of the Hundred Years' War between 1338 and 1341.[2] His Florentine bankers, the Bardi and the Peruzzi, were never in a position to be of much use to him after 1341 and they went bankrupt a few years later. His credit with the other foreign merchants stood fairly low in the early 'forties. The Hanseatic merchants received the entire revenue from the customs from May 1340 until 24 June 1343 in repayment of past royal debts to them, but at the end of that period the king still owed them £10,799[3] and no continuous large advances could be expected from this quarter. Edward's sole remaining possibility was to

[1] In Eileen Power's words, *op. cit.*, p. 84.

[2] E. B. Fryde, 'Edward III's War Finance, 1337–41' (D.Phil. dissertation, Oxford, 1947). Unpublished documents referred to in subsequent notes are all in the Public Record Office, London.

[3] Enrolled account of the Hansards, Pipe R. 16 Edw. III, E. 372/187, m. 54d; view of account, L.T.R. Memoranda R. 18 Edw. III, E. 368/116, *Status et Visus Compotorum*, Hilary, m. 4; certificate sent to the chancery (with notes of further payments), Chancery Miscellanea, C. 47/87/4, no. 31.

raise loans through the intermediary of the English merchants. Several of them, including some of the future farmers of the customs and their associates (John Wesenham, Walter Chiriton, John Goldbeter), were employed by Edward in 1341 and 1342 to sell royal wool abroad.[1] In July 1343 the Hansards were ordered to hand over the customs to an association of English merchants led by Thomas Melchebourn of Lynn.[2] Thirty-three associates of the English company are enumerated in the agreements with the king, but they were acting for a still larger body of English wool exporters. This English syndicate did not, at first, farm the customs, but only collected them for the king and anticipated future receipts by advances to the government. The men who launched it were above all interested in recovering old royal debts due to themselves and to other English merchants. They wanted to secure repayment of the so-called Dordrecht bonds. Early in 1338 the king had seized at Dordrecht in Zeeland wool of the English merchants valued at £110,000 and most of the resulting debts were still unpaid in 1343 when the Melchebourn company was founded to recover them. This large syndicate, representing all the main groups of English merchants, was narrowed down by March 1345 to a much smaller body with clearly monopolistic tendencies. The reorganized company assumed for the first time the *farm* of the customs and held it until August 1345. The farm then passed to a rival, John Wesenham of Lynn, who held it until October 1346.[3] Lastly,

[1] Enrolled accounts in L.T.R. Miscellaneous Acc., E. 358/10, mm. 26–7.

[2] Agreements with the king: *Cal. Close R. 1343–6*, pp. 217–18 (29 April 1343), 266–67 (8 July 1343), 573–74 (1 March 1345). Enrolled account, L.T.R. Customs Acc., E. 356/4, m. 1. Detailed 'state of account', K.R. Memoranda R. 19 Edw. III, mm. 243–44 (*Recorda*, Trinity). The history of the company is traced by G. Sayles, 'The "English Company" of 1343 and a Merchant's Oath', *Speculum*, vi (1931), pp. 177–205. Important evidence about the circumstances of its liquidation is in Exchequer Plea R., E. 13/78, mm. 34–5, and in *Cal. Close R. 1343–6*, pp. 648–9 (30 August 1345).

[3] Agreements with the king: *Cal. Close R. 1343–6*, pp. 648 (24 August 1345), 670–1 (8 November 1345), *Cal. Close R. 1346–9*, pp. 52 (15 February 1346), 290–1 (sale of royal wool, 2 April 1347). Accounts on Pipe R. 21 Edw. III, *Res. London*, (E. 372/192), continued on the London membranes of Pipe Rolls for 22–24 Edw. III; later debts of Wesenham were traced in the London membranes of the successive Pipe Rolls down to 30 Edw. III. Detailed 'state of account', K.R. Memoranda R. 20 Edw. III, mm. 149–53 (*Recorda*, Easter).

Walter Chiriton and Thomas Swanland of London, two former associates of the Melchebourn group, recovered the control over the farm from Wesenham by outbidding him and held it until they went bankrupt in April 1349.[1] After their bankruptcy the customs were entrusted to the sureties of Chiriton and Co., who were led by John Malwayn of London.[2] The Malwayn group acted not as farmers but as keepers, accounting for everything to the king. As a great speculative venture the farm only lasted four years, from March 1345 to April 1349.

The Melchebourn company paid to the king in two years (1343–5) slightly over £60,000 in cash.[3] Wesenham advanced at least £112,000 in payments spread over four years (1345–9). Chiriton's group provided at least £126,000 between May 1346 and April 1349. Finally the sureties of Chiriton and Co. paid to the king in two and a half years £131,000 (April 1349–October 1351). The recital of these payments might suggest that a class of enormously wealthy English capitalists had suddenly arisen. But a study of the sources of their capital should modify such an impression. The members of these partnerships do not seem to

[1] Agreements with the king: *Cal. Close R. 1346–9*, pp. 72–4 (21 May 1346), 248–49 (14 February 1347), 290–1 (sale of royal wool, 2 April 1347), L.T.R. Memoranda R. 23 Edw. III, m. 164 (2 March 1347), *Cal. Patent R. 1348–50*, p. 145, and K.R. Memoranda R. 23 Edw. III, mm. 120d–121 (2 May 1348). Accounts on Pipe R. 21 Edw. III, *Res. London*, continued on the London membranes of Pipe Rolls for 22–25 Edw. III; later debts of Chiriton and Co. were traced in the London membranes of the successive Pipe Rolls down to 30 Edw. III. Detailed 'states of account': L.T.R. Memoranda Rolls 22, 23, 24 and 26 Edw. III, *Status et Visus Compotorum*, and K.R. Memoranda R. 23 Edw. III, mm. 120d–121 (for the crucial period 1348–9). Business correspondence and vouchers: K.R. Exchequer Acc. Various, E. 101/128/3 and K.R. Customs Acc., E. 122/197/file 4, E. 122/158/13, E. 122/7/8. Special claims for allowances: E. 122/158/9A, L.T.R. Memoranda R. 26 Edw. III, mm. 238–41 and E. 122/158/14. Much information was also derived from Receipt and Issue Rolls for 1346–9 and from Exchequer Plea Rolls, E. 13/nos. 77–9.

[2] Agreement with the king, *Cal. Close R. 1349–54*, pp. 98–100 (21 April 1349). Agreement between Chiriton company and its sureties, L.T.R. Memoranda R. 30 Edw. III, *Recorda*, Hilary, m. 12 (24 May 1349). Account, K.R. Customs Acc., E. 122/158/37. Petition of the sureties for allowances, E. 122/158/38. Trial of the sureties, L.T.R. Memoranda R. 30 Edw. III, *Recorda*, Michaelmas, mm. 17–26.

[3] The totals in this paragraph do not include the old royal debts redeemed by the farmers.

have been very rich when they started financing the king; they were substantial, reputable merchants, but nothing more. They lacked the large initial capital resources such as the Italian firms had normally possessed at the time of their entry into the royal service.[1] The resources of the Melchebourn syndicate after its reorganization into a company of farmers were certainly not large.[2] Most is known about the internal history of the Chiriton company, because it ultimately went bankrupt and we have therefore the names of many of its creditors. In two and a half years Chiriton and Co. borrowed at least £53,000 and probably a good deal more. They raised money through a multitude of short-term loans which had soon to be repaid. A number of these loans had to be contracted on rather onerous terms. Several previous loans could be repaid only by borrowing from somebody else. The Chiriton company was excessively dependent on the good will of a number of important backers and it had to surrender to them a large share of its profits.

The wealthiest men were mainly to be found not in the companies of the farmers but behind them. These richer financiers lent money to the farmers and acted as intermediaries in helping the farming companies to raise funds. The farmers were supported by several London notables, including Henry Picard, John Pulteney, Adam Fraunceys, John Pyel and Thomas Dolsely (aldermen in the 'forties or subsequently). The German merchants in England, led by Tidemann of Limberg, helped to finance both Wesenham and Chiriton.[3] An important group of wool exporters from York, headed by John Goldbeter, must be ranked among the more important supporters of the Chiriton company. These backers entered into individual bargains with the farmers as it suited their convenience, but they exacted a stiff price for this support. They also carefully avoided anything that might seriously involve them in the liabilities of the farmers to the crown

[1] The Bardi of Florence possessed in 1318 assets valued at 875,000 florins (equivalent, at the rate of 3s. to 1 florin, to £131,250). Cf. A. Sapori, *La Crisi delle Compagnie Mercantili dei Bardi e dei Peruzzi* (Florence, 1926), p. 216.

[2] Exchequer Plea R., E. 13/78, mm. 34–5; see also a list of debts in Sayles, *loc. cit.*, pp. 196–8.

[3] A. Beardwood, *Alien Merchants in England, 1350 to 1377* (Cambridge, Mass., 1931), pp. 17–21, summarizes the main facts of Limberg's career.

or in any other compromising contracts. We know, for example, of one loan contracted by Chiriton and Co. through the brokerage of Picard where the money came from financiers who did not want their names disclosed. Picard persuaded Tidemann of Limberg to figure as the ostensible lender, while Picard's name was likewise kept out of the formal contracts.[1]

The English farmers of the customs had thus to lend mainly other people's money. Furthermore, as they lacked initially considerable resources of their own, they needed special financial and trading privileges before they could assume the functions of the king's bankers. Edward III had to provide the assets on the security of which they might try to borrow money. They were middlemen artificially boosted up by the king so that they might be able to raise money from people who would not have lent to the government directly.

The customs formed the chief asset entrusted by the king to these English companies. For this concession they had to pay to the crown a fixed annual rent of £50,000, but they could also be required, in addition, to advance loans. A petition of the commons in 1348 estimated the annual revenue from the wartime subsidy at £60,000.[2] Corroborative evidence is provided by the account of the sureties of Chiriton and Co., who in their character as *custodes* of the customs had to account for everything. In the fiscal year 1350–1 the ancient custom and the subsidy together yielded in their hands £78,958 (on 34,694 sacks).[3] The annual expenses of collecting the customs did not exceed about £700.[4] Thus the farmers could reckon in a normal year on a considerable profit from the difference between the total yield of the customs and the rent of £50,000 due to the king. But in practice they had to forgo much of this profit in favour of their own creditors. The customs formed the principal foundation for the credit operations of the farmers. The anticipated revenue from the customs could be assigned in advance to creditors. Indeed, the farmers went

[1] Exchequer Plea R., E. 13/78, m. 116.

[2] *Rot*[*uli*] *Parl*[*iamentorum*], ii. 200 (no. 4).

[3] K.R. Customs Acc., E. 122/158/37, and L.T.R. Memoranda R. 30 Edw. III, *Recorda*, Michaelmas, m. 18d.

[4] E. 122/158/37. The regular expenses were assessed at £631 6s. 8d. a year. In two and a half years the keepers of the customs actually spent £1,718 6s. 8d. (including some extraordinary expenditure).

further still, and allowed some of their specially favoured supporters to export wool free of duty or paying duty at privileged rates. Thus, Chiriton's firm allowed creditors rebates on the customs amounting to 20% or even 33⅓%. Chiriton and Co. obviously assumed that they could do as they liked with the customs as long as they paid the fixed annual rent for them. But they were also clearly aware that such rebates were illegal without proper royal authorization and they tried to cover up these irregularities by ordering their agents at harbours to make false entries in the records. A letter from Swanland to the collectors of customs at Lynn rebukes them for their refusal to carry out one of these orders.[1] When many years later these practices were discovered by the exchequer, it instituted criminal proceedings against the culprits.[2]

During prolonged periods these English companies enjoyed also the monopoly of wool export. Furthermore, Chiriton and Wesenham handled between them the forced loan of 20,000 sacks of wool levied by the crown in 1347. It was complained in parliament that they secured this contract on terms very favourable to themselves.[3] Several lengthy embargoes on export were imposed in order to raise the price of wool abroad and enhance the profits of the monopolists. During those periods only our financiers and their privileged creditors were allowed to ship wool abroad. According to a petition of the commons, others might be allowed to export only if they paid to the farmers, in addition to the custom and subsidy, a further 'loan' of 2 marks per sack.[4] Chiriton's correspondence with his agents confirms the truth of these allegations.[5] Thus the concession of the farm of the customs to English business men became the starting point for a whole series of arrangements that gave the farmers fairly complete control over the entire wool trade.

The farmers enjoyed yet another source of profit. They were given licences to buy up, at a discount, old royal debts. A vast

[1] E. 122/7/8 no. 11. Several other mandates about the rebates on customs in the same file.

[2] Exchequer Plea R., E. 13/75, m. 21 and E. 13/79, m. 99; K.R. Memoranda R. 41 Edw. III, *Recorda*, Easter, m. 7.

[3] *Rot. Parl.*, ii. 170 (no. 49).

[4] *Ibid.*, pp. 169 (no. 38), 201 (no. 8).

[5] K.R. Customs Acc., E. 122/149/3.

mass of such debts had accumulated since the outbreak of the war in 1337. By 1343 it was becoming clear to most of the creditors that in the ordinary course of events they would never get their money back. The efforts of the wool merchants to recover the Dordrecht debts had produced the first Melchebourn company in that year. By September 1344 the idea arose of allowing the English financiers to relieve the king of other debts as well. They bought them up at a discount and secured an allowance in the farm of the customs for the full face value of the debts so redeemed. Here is one concrete example. John Wesenham owed to the king for the farm of the customs during fifteen months £62,000. But he was allowed to contribute £20,000 out of this total in restored royal bonds, so that he was obliged to provide in cash only £42,000. The profits of the English companies thus partly depended on the rate of discount at which they could acquire royal obligations. The commons complained in 1348 that royal debts were being bought up for 1s. or 2s. in the pound.[1] This was an entirely justified accusation. The exchequer accepted in 1352 the testimony of several trustworthy witnesses that normally 2s. or 2s. 6d. in the pound were paid, but seldom more.[2] But the farmers did not have everything their own way in this matter. The supply of small debts was considerable, but bonds for larger amounts were not so easy to acquire, and as they were usually held by more important people they were likely to be relatively more expensive. Furthermore, the farmers had to forgo some of their profit from this source by having to sub-contract a part of their lucrative privilege to their own creditors. By conceding to the farmers the right to obtain profit in this way, Edward III was avoiding the necessity of paying much interest on their loans to him. Here was a profitable way of getting new money out of old debts.[3]

The main features of the royal dealings with the farmers of the customs might be summed up as follows. The war brought a considerable increase in the revenue from the customs. This provided special opportunities for royal borrowing from financiers

[1] *Rot. Parl.*, ii. 170 (no. 49).

[2] 'Testatum est per plures fidedignos quod communiter libra empta fuit pro iis. et iis. vid. et raro ad plus': K.R. Customs Acc., E. 122/158/37.

[3] Royal debts amounting to at least £84,000 were redeemed by the farmers and some other English financiers between 1343 and 1355.

who did not possess very much capital of their own, that is the English merchants as opposed to the richer Italian firms. The manipulation of the wool trade supplied further chances of monopoly profits, but this was bound to exasperate the other, lesser English merchants and to hurt the interests of the producers of wool. The large amount of floating royal debt gave Edward III unusual opportunities for remunerating lenders without any great cost to the crown. But this produced a wave of speculation in royal bonds and debentures that increased considerably the unpopularity of the English farmers of the customs.

II

The English syndicate created in 1343, though ostensibly led by Thomas Melchebourn, was really founded by William de la Pole of Hull.[1] *Inceptor*, *fundator*, and *principalis socius eiusdem societatis* are some of the terms used by his partners about him. In 1343–4 his associates were, however, obviously nervous about the real intentions of their masterful 'chairman' and showed their distrust by trying to bind him by a series of detailed promises to pursue the collective good of their firm.[2] It is probable that Pole was chiefly actuated in 1343 by a desire to recover the favour of the king which he had forfeited since 1340. He had been one of the founders of the English wool company of 1337 and the king blamed him for the miscarriage of that scheme. He was one of the officials and financiers arrested by Edward III on 30 November 1340, and was detained in prison until May 1342, longer than any other victim.[3] Pole's main remaining asset was his capacity to influence the other English merchants. By creating a new English company in 1343 he managed to convince Edward III of his continued usefulness to the crown.[4] He was

[1] No satisfactory life of Pole exists. The latest biography is in A. S. Harvey, *The de la Pole family of Kingston upon Hull* (East Yorkshire Local History Society, 1957).

[2] All the foregoing evidence on Pole's relations with his partners is derived from Sayles, *loc. cit.*

[3] E. B. Fryde, 'Edward III's Wool Monopoly of 1337', *History*, xxxvii (1952).

[4] Pole tried to persuade the king of the potential value of his services while he was still in prison (Ancient Petitions, S.C. 8, no. 3369).

restored to royal favour in the spring of 1344.[1] In July 1344 the previous judicial proceedings against him were annulled.

Pole used the new company for his own ends in yet another way. Since his disgrace in 1340 he could not recover the large debts owed to him by the king. Therefore, two days before the formal launching of the Melchebourn company, he sold to it his outstanding Dordrecht debt. It amounted to £2,039 and he sold it for £2,000, of which £1,200 were paid to him fairly promptly by the company. He omitted to disclose to his collaborators that he had, in fact, already recovered £636 on this bond in 1339. When they discovered this many years later they tried to prosecute Pole.[2]

After Pole was rehabilitated and was allowed to assume openly the leadership of the company, startling changes followed. In August 1344 he was authorized by the king to reorganize the Melchebourn syndicate as he saw fit. From an association of thirty-three members it shrank to a group of seven active partners.[3] The retiring associates were awarded compensation, but years later one of them complained that he had only received half the promised sum.[4] In March 1345 the reorganized company assumed the farm of the customs and this arrangement was made retrospective from midsummer 1343. Furthermore, in March 1345 Pole's new firm was conceded the right to redeem all kinds of royal debts. Henceforth all the successive companies farming the customs enjoyed this privilege. Pole must be regarded as the creator of the farming scheme in its final form, which remained henceforth substantially unaltered until 1349.

The syndicate reorganized by Pole only lasted until August 1345. The immediate reason for its abandonment of the farm was lack of funds. It had undertaken to advance a loan of 20,000 marks to the king, but could not raise the necessary money. It had asked John Wesenham to lend half this sum, but he had refused. Wesenham demanded instead that the farm should be

[1] Gifts of valuable plate by Pole to the king at Easter 1344 (Wetwang's wardrobe book, E. 101/390/12, p. 50); royal order to return Pole's lands, 27 April 1344 (*Cal. Close R. 1343–6*, p. 311).

[2] Exchequer Plea R., E. 13/79, m. 59.

[3] Pole, Thomas and William Melchebourn, Walter Chiriton, Walter Prest, Roger Wolesthorp and Henry Tideswell. The last two should probably be regarded as personal agents of Pole.

[4] Sayles, *loc. cit.*, p. 204.

entirely handed over to him and this was done. In return, Wesenham agreed to assume the liabilities of Pole and his associates towards the king.[1] Pole now disappears from our story. Thereafter he acted occasionally as an adviser to the royal government and he advanced personally loans to the crown, but he was not publicly connected with any of the later English syndicates. After 1345 he was not on good terms with his former associates and it is possible that the collapse of the Melchebourn company was, in reality, partly due to the withdrawal of support by Pole. In 1353 he was accused of not bearing his share of the liabilities left behind by that company.[2]

The new firm of John Wesenham appears to have been fairly successful. It carried out all its undertakings to the king. It helped to finance the preparations for the victorious campaign of 1346. Like his predecessors, Wesenham had to borrow much from others. Thus the 20,000 marks that he had undertaken to lend instead of the Melchebourns had to be borrowed in Flanders and transported to England.[3] His contract for the farm of the customs was due to expire at Michaelmas 1346. Wesenham could not secure its renewal, because as early as May 1346 a rival group, led by Walter Chiriton and other former associates of the Melchebourns, had made a higher bid for it. According to the king they offered more than anybody else.[4] This caused an open quarrel between the Chiriton group and Wesenham[5] which was never entirely healed. The various backers of the farmers aligned themselves on different sides. These divisions were a source of weakness to the Chiriton group in later years.

III

When Chiriton's group secured the farm of the customs in May 1346 by outbidding Wesenham, it could not have foreseen that it was committing itself to the financing of the siege of Calais that would last eleven months. Chiriton's son claimed subsequently that his father's company had provided 100,000 marks (£66,666)

[1] Exchequer Plea R., E. 13/78, mm. 34–5. [2] Sayles, *loc. cit.*

[3] Issue R. Michaelmas 1345–6, E. 403/336, under 10 April 1346.

[4] L.T.R. Mem. R. 23 Edw. III, m. 164: 'par cause qils ont pris noz dites custumes a ferme dune graunt somme par an plus haut q'autres y voudreient doner'. [5] Exchequer Plea R., E. 13/78, m. 116.

for the siege.[1] It is impossible to disentangle in the existing accounts the advances in France from other payments, but Chiriton and Co. supplied to the king between Michaelmas 1346 and his return to England on 12 October 1347 at least £55,000 and probably more. These payments had partly to be made abroad and often in a hurry. Transfers of money from England involved additional expense, while the alternative of borrowing from 'Belgian'[2] and Italian financiers in Flanders proved exceptionally costly. Thus, four bargains at Bruges and Ghent involved a loss of 37% on nearly £16,000.[3] Debts were incurred that could not be repaid at the stipulated time, so that costs mounted up. Chiriton's letters speak of contracts that had to be broken at a heavy loss. The finances of Chiriton and Co. never properly recovered from this strain.

The initial concession of the farm to the Chiriton group was due to expire at Michaelmas 1348. But already in May 1348 they negotiated its renewal until Michaelmas 1351,[4] on conditions that they were probably incapable of fulfilling. There are several indications that they were in serious difficulties already in the spring and early summer of 1348, some months before the epidemic of plague spread in England. It may be that they were trying to cling at all costs to the farm as the only way of repairing their fortunes.

There are multiple reasons for this pessimism about the prospects of Chiriton's firm in May 1348. The farm was renewed on 2 May 1348. On the following day a very distressing letter was sent by Chiriton and Swanland to one of their chief collaborators in Flanders. They told him to abandon cloth valued at £1,800 pledged to moneylenders at Ghent, because there was no money to redeem it.[5] In July 1348 Chiriton had to repledge to Wesenham and the earl of Arundel the king's great crown for a loan of £4,000.[6] Of still greater significance is the failure of the farmers to fulfil one of the essential conditions for the renewal of the farm.

[1] Ancient Petitions, S.C. 8/111, no. 5519.

[2] They were in all likelihood Flemings, but may have been Brabanters.

[3] A statement of Chiriton and Co. about their losses, K.R. Customs Acc., E. 122/197/4, file 4.

[4] A third partner, Gilbert Wendlyngburgh, joined Chiriton and Swanland.

[5] E. 122/197/4, file 3, no. 15: 'et lessez les draps estre perditz qar nous ne porroms qant a ore faire le paiement'.

[6] L.T.R. Mem. R. 23 Edw. III, m. 163.

They had undertaken to advance to the king an additional loan of £20,000 between May and October 1348. If they carried out this payment punctually, they were promised an allowance of £8,000 in the farm of the customs, as a royal 'gift' (i.e. interest on the loan). But in spite of strenuous efforts they were unable to pay more than £17,900 by Michaelmas 1348. As a result, the exchequer refused to give them the stipulated allowance of £8,000.[1] It is important to stress that already before Michaelmas 1348, that is before the plague had affected the English export trade from the eastern harbours, Chiriton's firm proved incapable of carrying out properly a vital contract.

Chiriton and Co. had increased their indebtedness in 1348 by an unlucky speculation in wool. It is best described in the words of the exchequer officials. They recorded that on various occasions in 1347 and 1348 free export was stopped 'at the request of the farmers themselves so that they could buy their wools more cheaply in England and sell them more dearly abroad'.[2] The longest of these embargoes lasted for a year, from October 1347 to October 1348, when Chiriton was also engaged in selling royal wool from the wool levy of 1347. The stoppage of export was never entirely complete, as shipments by Chiriton's privileged creditors still continued. Thus during an entire year Chiriton's company had little or no revenue from the customs. According to a later statement of Chiriton's son, during that year his father's firm had to pay to the king over £35,000, none of which could be raised from the customs, but had to be borrowed at a loss.[3] Some confirmation comes from the records of dealings between Chiriton's syndicate and the merchants of York led by John Goldbeter. This important group of Chiriton's creditors advanced around £20,000 between March 1347 and August 1348, mainly to finance payments in Flanders. They were promised repayment out of the customs. They recovered a certain amount by being permitted to export their own wool despite the embargo. Most of the repayment was delayed, however, until August and September 1348 when, for the first time, considerable sums were

[1] K.R. Mem. R. 23 Edw. III, mm. 120d–121.

[2] L.T.R. Mem. R. 26 Edw. III, m. 239d: 'arrestum huiusmodi . . . factum fuit ad procuracionem ipsorum mercatorum ut ipsi lanas suas in Anglia foro meliori emere et postmodum carius vendere possent in partibus transmarinis'.

[3] E. 122/158/14.

paid to them by the collectors of customs at east coast harbours.[1] Even then not all the debts to Goldbeter could be repaid: £3,600 were still due to him after Chiriton's bankruptcy.[2]

By the summer of 1348 Chiriton's firm had mortgaged its future in yet another way. Initially the farmers had attached great value to their privilege of purchasing royal debts at a discount. Early in 1347 Chiriton and Co. were even buying up the royal licences given to other financiers for the same purpose.[3] By May 1348 the speculation in royal debts was turning into a source of trouble rather than profit. It was becoming more difficult to acquire enough bonds and debentures. Serious frauds came to light. Faked wardrobe debentures had been fabricated in some quantity and had been offered to the exchequer for repayment by various dealers. It was discovered that some debts had been repaid by the crown twice over. It also transpired that virtually all the Dordrecht bonds included payments for wool illegally smuggled. Prolonged inquiries followed at the exchequer.[4] This was very discouraging to Chiriton's syndicate, which disclaimed all responsibility for the shortcomings of the deeds that they were bringing to the exchequer. As one royal letter puts it, Chiriton and Co. 'fear to make such restitution because those bills are found to be false and counterfeit'.[5] Therefore, in the agreement of 2 May 1348 their firm was given a respite until October 1351 from having to account for redeemed royal debts. At the time of their bankruptcy in April 1349, Chiriton and Co. were obliged, under various agreements with the king, to restore royal debts to the total value of £38,166. These obligations had been largely incurred already by May 1348. It is doubtful whether their company would have ever been in a position to redeem this huge

[1] E. 122/197/4 and E. 122/7/8.

[2] Exchequer Plea R., E. 13/78, mm. 18–19.

[3] *Cal. Close R. 1346–9*, p. 260 and Exchequer Plea R., E. 13/79, mm. 17–18.

[4] Forgeries of wardrobe bills and dealings in them: *Cal. Pat. R. 1345–8*, p. 117; A. Steel, 'The Negotiation of Wardrobe Debentures in the Fourteenth Century', *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, xliv (1929); G. O. Sayles, 'A Dealer in Wardrobe Bills', *Econ. Hist. Rev.*, iii (1931). Dordrecht bonds: L.T.R. Mem. R. 24 Edw. III, mm. 234–5. For a shocking case of double repayment see K.R. Mem. R. 23 Edw. III, *Recorda*, Hilary, mm. 6–8 (Paul de Monte Florum and John Pulteney). Appointment of a special exchequer official to scrutinize restored royal obligations, K.R. Mem. R. 27 Edw. III, mm. 137–9.

[5] *Cal. Close R. 1346–9*, p. 606.

amount of debt. Their sureties had ultimately to be excused most of it (£30,500).[1]

Clearly much was amiss in the affairs of Chiriton and Co. in the summer of 1348. When their company collapsed in April 1349, its main debt to the king consisted of the arrears of the farm for the year from Michaelmas 1347 to Michaelmas 1348 (over £21,500).[2] Without an epidemic of plague spreading over much of southern England in the autumn of 1348 they could have probably carried on their business, but their position would have continued to be difficult. Chiriton and Co. had been presumably reckoning on an improvement in their situation after free export of wool was resumed at Michaelmas 1348 and the customs began to yield again much revenue. This would have permitted them to reduce their debts and to improve their credit. Instead came a temporary but very serious dislocation of trade as the pestilence spread. Chiriton and Co. were too enfeebled to survive this emergency. Between October 1348 and March 1349 their firm was displaying clear signs of distress. They defaulted on a number of payments. They failed even to carry out the assignments in favour of Prince Edward and Henry, earl of Lancaster, whom above all they must have desired to satisfy.[3] Chiriton's creditors demanded tangible securities and valuable assets had to be pledged to them. Among other things, his firm had to pawn to its creditors several exchequer tallies of assignment (drawn on Chiriton and Co.) to a total value of £13,000. These assignments had been executed by Chiriton's company, but until it produced the tallies at the exchequer, it could not be credited with those payments by the crown.[4] The company's creditors knew that Chiriton and Co. would make every effort to recover the tallies. Chiriton's failure to do so is a clear indication of the virtual bankruptcy of his firm. The end came in March and April 1349,

[1] L.T.R. Mem. R. 24 Edw. III, mm. 32d–33.

[2] L.T.R. Mem. R. 23 Edw. III, mm. 162d–164. This was the debt for which they were imprisoned.

[3] L.T.R. Mem. R. 26 Edw. III, m. 239d (assignment of £1,000 in favour of the Black Prince), m. 241 (assignment of £5,000 in favour of the earl of Lancaster).

[4] Memoranda Rolls: E. 159/125, mm. 120d–121; E. 368/122, m. 240; E. 368/124, mm. 238–41. The creditors were Henry Picard, John Pulteney, Nicholas Ploket, Adam Fraunceys and John Pyel, all of London, Walter Payl of Melton Mowbray and William Pembridge.

when the plague was at its height in London.[1] On 21 April 1349 the king handed over the customs to a new group acting as the sureties of Chiriton and Co. They were to carry on with Chiriton's contract for the rest of its duration, and they undertook to use any surplus over and above the annual farm to pay back Chiriton's debts to the king. The sureties were not to repay other debts due to the personal creditors of Chiriton's company.

The fallen farmers were never able to discharge the liabilities incurred before April 1349. They were imprisoned in June 1349 for their debts to the crown.[2] They had been making frantic attempts to satisfy their private creditors first and were thus diverting assets that should have gone to the king. Their sureties regarded them with enmity for this reason and this was apparently the cause of the lengthy imprisonment of Chiriton and Swanland.[3] They were released only in June or July 1351.[4] All their property remained permanently in the king's hands.

Malwayn's group wound up successfully its custody of the customs at Michaelmas 1351 and even achieved a surplus of £14,279 over a period of two and a half years. As long as the farm of the customs was divorced from more reckless ventures, it clearly could still be a paying proposition. At Michaelmas 1351 Malwayn was retained for another year in the royal service as 'keeper of the customs', but resigned this commission already at Easter 1352.[5] Henceforth for nearly twenty years no single English merchant or group of merchants wanted to be responsible for the customs.

The farming of the customs and the financial schemes connected with it profited only a small group of business men at the expense of most other economic interests in England. The wool producers, the lesser merchants and the majority of the royal creditors were especially bound to suffer. The English financiers behaved in an arbitrary and unscrupulous way which increased

[1] Orders to sheriffs to seize the lands and goods of Chiriton and Co., 15 March 1349 (*Cal. Close R. 1349–54*, p. 61).

[2] L.T.R. Mem. R. 23 Edw. III, mm. 162d–64.

[3] Malwayn's statement in November 1355 (E. 122/158/38, m. 1). For examples of the 'misbehaviour' of Chiriton and Co. see Exchequer Plea Rolls, E. 13/75, mm. 12d–14, and mm. 29–31, E. 13/76 m. 4, and *Cal. Patent R. 1350–4*, pp. 265–6.

[4] L.T.R. Mem. R. 24 Edw. III, m. 240.

[5] L.T.R. Customs Acc., E. 356/4, m. 3.

still further their unpopularity. There were repeated complaints in parliaments about their conduct and about the abuses they perpetrated or at least condoned. What their countrymen thought about them was shown most clearly in September 1353. A Great Council procured from the king an ordinance prohibiting export of wool and other staple English articles by Englishmen, Irishmen and Welshmen on pain of life and limb and of the confiscation of all goods and chattels.[1] This was enacted to put an end to all monopolies controlled by the English financiers and to prevent their emergence in the future. During the next four years foreign merchants alone controlled England's foreign trade. A fiscal arrangement that had provoked such deep enmity might not have endured much longer even without the accident of the plague of 1348–9.

[1] *Rot. Parl.*, ii. 246–53 (especially no. 6, p. 247).

RANK AND EMOLUMENT IN THE BRITISH DIPLOMATIC SERVICE 1689–1789

By Professor D. B. Horn, D.Litt., F.R.Hist.S.

READ 8 FEBRUARY 1958

FROM the institution of resident diplomatic missions in the fifteenth century a basic distinction has been drawn between ambassadors, either ordinary or extraordinary, and ministers of less eminence, often described as residents. By the late seventeenth century, however, various intermediate grades had become established. For example, a decree of the States of Holland, passed on 29 March 1651, mentions 'ambassadors, resident envoys, agents or other ministers'.[1] Much the most important intermediate rank was that of envoy extraordinary, which under Louis XIV became much commoner than before, while the gulf between the envoy and the mere resident grew steadily.[2] The title of resident is said to have been degraded when the lesser German courts gave or even sold the title to persons who had no diplomatic functions at all.[3] The increasing use made of envoys in the seventeenth century was partly due to a desire for economy, but at least as much to the desire of sovereigns to avoid or at least reduce the number of quarrels between ambassadors[4] where there were several ambassadors at the same court and no generally accepted rules of precedence. Thus Frederick William, the great elector of Brandenburg, is said not to have appointed any ambassadors.[5] There was a similar reluctance at Genoa[6] and in Sweden[7] and

[1] Cornelius Van Bynkershoek, *De Foro Legatorum Liber Singularis. A Monograph on the Jurisdiction over Ambassadors* (reprinted Oxford and London, 1946, ed. G. J. Laing), p. 10.

[2] Picavet, *La Diplomatie Française au temps de Louis XIV*, p. 74; O. Krauske, *Entwickelung d. ständigen Diplomatie*, pp. 162–3.

[3] Krauske, *op. cit.*, pp. 165, 174.

[4] These are dealt with *ad nauseam* in Wicquefort and Callières.

[5] Satow, *Guide to Diplomatic Practice*, 4th ed., p. 165.

[6] Vitale, *La Diplomazia Genovese*, pp. 16–17.

[7] *Histoire de l'administration des affaires étrangères de Suède*, ed. S. Tunberg and others, pp. 235 ff.

elsewhere in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth century. When Cobden proposed and carried in the Select Committee of 1850 on Public Salaries the abolition of embassies he was much less of a radical than his contemporaries thought.[1] Callières, whose famous treatise sums up the experience of Louis XIV's reign, arranges diplomatic agents in a regular hierarchy: (1) ambassadors; (2) envoys extraordinary; (3) residents; (4) secretaries; (5) agents, and explains that the additional title of plenipotentiary is given according to the occasion either to ambassadors or envoys.[2] Writing early in the eighteenth century, Cornelius Van Bynkershoek probably summed up pretty fairly the general practice when he wrote: 'Envoys were formerly less frequently employed than they are to-day; residents were at one time more numerous than they are at present; agents are as common to-day as before, but in earlier times they were held in higher esteem than they are now.' [3]

In England under Charles II there was a clear division into ambassadors, envoys and residents. William III's practice corresponded very closely with this. As king of England he appointed twelve ambassadors, forty-two envoys extraordinary, one of whom enjoyed also the title of plenipotentiary, six residents, four secretaries (with creditive letters)[4] and three agents. In addition he appointed four secretaries of embassy, a rank ignored by Callières since under Louis XIV they were the private servants of the ambassadors,[5] whereas under the English administration they were appointed and paid by the crown. His other appointments include three 'Ministers', three 'Commissaries' and two

[1] H.C. (1850), XV, xv.

[2] *De la Manière de négocier avec les souverains*, English translation ed. A. F. Whyte (1919), pp. 71–6. Pecquet, *Discours sur l'art de négocier* (Paris, 1737), p. 135, recognizes only three clear grades: (1) ambassador; (2) envoy; and (3) resident.

[3] *De Foro Legatorum*, p. 64.

[4] Excluding mere *chargés d'affaires*. These and subsequent figures are based, with a few adjustments, on the lists published in *British Diplomatic Representatives 1689–1789*, Camden Third Series, no. 46 (1932). They do not include diplomatic representatives sent to international conferences who were not accredited to the sovereign in whose territory the conference was held, nor do they include occasional embassies to non-European countries, especially the Barbary states. For some purposes I have also left out of account agents who received credentials but did not take up the appointment.

[5] Picavet, *op. cit.*, pp. 78–9.

diplomatic agents who seem to have received no special rank. Under Anne more ambassadors are appointed and ministers plenipotentiary appear in their own right, without the title of ambassador or envoy, although about a fifth of Anne's envoys also had the title of plenipotentiary.[1] No fewer than thirty-two appointments by Anne were made in no special rank, many of them being to temporary naval or military missions necessitated by war conditions. Under George I there was a further marked increase in the number of ministers plenipotentiary and residents, and a parallel decline in the number of envoys extraordinary and ministers with no special rank. Under George II the most obvious changes were a jump in the number of ministers plenipotentiary and ministers[2] and a less marked increase in the number of secretaries of embassy. In the first twenty-nine years of the reign of George III there seems to be a greater readiness to appoint ambassadors: there are certainly more appointments to the rank of envoy, and a rather larger percentage of envoys enjoy the additional rank and pay of plenipotentiary; there is a corresponding decline in the number of residents, but for the first time secretaries of embassy equal the ambassadors in number.

Taking the whole period we have the figures shown in the table on page 22.

The most notable features in this table are the introduction and progressive rise in number of ministers plenipotentiary (0 to 38), envoys with additional rank of plenipotentiary (1 to 25),

[1] 'The commission of Plenipotentiary', Dartmouth wrote to Prior, 'does not give you a representing character' (*Bolingbroke Correspondence*, ed. G. Parke, ii. 324). Cf. the difference in treatment accorded at the French court in the early eighteenth century to envoys who were also plenipotentiaries and to mere ministers plenipotentiary (Coxe, *Memoirs of Lord Walpole*, i. 136–7).

[2] Callières regards the title of plenipotentiary as occasional, given chiefly to ministers accredited to the German Diet at Ratisbon, and Pecquet regards it as 'un titre passager, sans autre décoration que le relief attaché naturellement à un emploi de confiance, qui ne peut rien exiger, mais qui attire de la considération et du respect' (*Discours*, p. 136). Similarly he excludes minister from the hierarchy of ranks as being a vague description 'qui naît de la commission qu'un particulier a d'administrer dans un païs étranger les affaires de son maître. Ce n'est même que depuis peu que l'usage s'en est établi: on l'a jugé plus commode, parce qu'il n'assujettit à aucun cérémonial, et parce qu'il peut être porté par des personnes de différente naissance, sans qu'on puisse en rougir ou s'en trop glorifier' (*ibid.*, pp. 135–6).

Appointments in the reign of	Ambassadors	Ministers plenipotentiary	Ministers[1]	Envoys extraordinary and ministers plenipotentiary	Envoys extraordinary	Residents	Secretaries of embassy	No special rank	Commissaries[2]	Secretaries or chargés with creditive letters	Agents[2]	Secretaries of legation	Total
William and Mary 1689–1702	12	0	3	1	42	6	4	2	3	4	3	0	80
Anne 1702–14	22	3	2	11	43	10	5	32	1	7	0	0	136
George I 1714–27	15	9	7	17	17	17	5	19	0	4	1	0	111
George II 1727–60	18	29	31	14	19	19	10	16	1	6	0	0	163
George III 1760–89	24	38	16	25	29	10	25	6	1	2	0	5	181
Total	91	79	59	68	150	62	49	75	6	23	4	5	671

secretaries of embassy (4 to 24), and 'ministers' (3 to 16). The envoys, who had been the backbone of the British diplomatic service under William III and Anne, form a much smaller percentage of the total appointments under the Hanoverian kings. Residents, after showing a tendency to increase up to the early Hanoverian period, decline under George III; appointments in no special rank declined steadily under the Hanoverians from the peak reached under Anne.

Few British diplomatists reached the dignity of ambassador. If we exclude the anomalous Turkish embassy,[3] there were only sixty-nine ambassadors appointed in a hundred years. Only our diplomatic representatives at the French court were regularly appointed with the rank of ambassador from 1689 to 1789, but owing to the frequent wars they were not numerous. Appointments in the rank of ambassador throughout the period were also frequent (but not regular) to the United Provinces. They were made occasionally to Spain in the first half of the period and regularly after 1746. Occasionally made to Austria and Portugal

[1] Including some who are more accurately described as 'plenipotentiary'.

[2] Only those commissaries and agents who actually undertook diplomatic work are included.

[3] On which see A. C. Wood's article, *Eng. Hist. Rev.* xl (1925), 533–61.

in the first half of the period, they were frequently made to Russia after 1743. No other country except Venice (with four appointments) received more than two British ambassadors in these hundred years. This tradition of keeping ambassadorial appointments at a minimum continued into the twentieth century. As late as 1910 there were only eight ambassadors in the British diplomatic service compared with the present figure of about fifty.[1]

In the earlier part of the period ambassadors often did not have a secretary of embassy provided by the government: under George III this had become an invariable practice, and it was being extended by the introduction in the late 1780's of an entirely new practice of appointing to the more important legations a government appointed and paid secretary of legation.[2] Another interesting departure which occurs after the early years of George III's reign is the practice of appointing some of the secretaries of embassy to France and Spain as ministers plenipotentiary, thus enabling them to carry on the embassy business in the absence of their chief with greater prestige and, it was hoped, increased efficiency and promptitude.[3]

Leaving out of account the heterogeneous class of ministers plenipotentiary, these diplomatic representatives may be grouped in six categories, in descending order of rank and emoluments: [4]

[1] Lord Strang, *Home and Abroad*, p. 309.

[2] Those secretaries were paid at a uniform rate of £1 a day (46 C[ommons] J[ournals], 592), Berlin 1785, St. Petersburg 1787, Vienna 1789, and Copenhagen 1790. According to Lord Whitworth the experiment was not a success at St. Petersburg since the secretary was excluded from Petersburg society. He advocated instead appointment of unpaid attachés (H[ist.]M[SS.] C[omm.], *Fortescue MSS.*, ii. 226).

[3] See Satow, *Guide to Dip. Practice*, p. 256, for the continuation of this practice into the twentieth century. It was anticipated to some extent under George II (Chesterfield, *Letters*, ed. Bradshaw, i. 433, 465–6).

[4] Particulars of payments to foreign ministers can readily be obtained from the Treasury records preserved in the P[ublic] R[ecord] O[ffice] (general reference E. 403). Much information is available in print for the period 1689–1745 in the three series of official publications, *Calendar of Treasury Books* (1689–1714), *Calendar of Treasury Papers* (1714–30) and *Calendar of Treasury Books and Papers* (1731–45). For the middle period (1752–69) statements of civil list payments, etc., to foreign ministers and consuls are printed in 32 *C.J.* 466–603. After Burke's Bill for Economical Reform came into operation 'the salaries of the ministers to foreign courts being resident at the said Courts' are grouped in one class and the amounts

(1) Ambassador, ordinary or extraordinary, with or without the title of plenipotentiary, £100 a week, or less frequently £10 a day.[1]
(2) Envoy extraordinary and plenipotentiary, £8 a day.[2]
(3) Envoy extraordinary, £5 a day.
(4) Minister, £3–£5 a day.
(5) Resident, £3 a day.
(6) Secretary of embassy or secretary at a court where no British minister was resident, £2 a day.

Ministers plenipotentiary received anything from £3 to £10 a day, the lower figure being customary when the title of plenipotentiary was added to some other rank in the service, e.g. envoy extraordinary or secretary of embassy.

Special arrangements applied throughout this period to the Constantinople embassy, where the ambassador was paid by the Levant Company at rates which tended to decline after 1689.[3] From 1762 the ambassadors normally received a government subsidy of £3 a day in addition to their pay from the Company: [4] in 1795 the latter was raised from £1,000 to £2,000 a year.[5] After 1804, when the government assumed sole responsibility for the ambassador's salary, he continued to be paid at a lower rate than the other ambassadors; but at least down to 1809 he enjoyed some lucrative perquisites which they did not share.[6]

These ordinary payments commenced on the day of the diplomatist's 'departure out of the presence' and normally continued

paid to each are printed annually in the *Commons Journals*, e.g. 40 *C.J.* 328–33. Some additional information may be gleaned from the *Calendar of Home Office Papers* for the years 1761–75.

[1] Lord Mahon, *History of England*, i. 30, suggests that in Anne's reign the higher rate was paid to ambassadors to France, Spain and the Emperor, the lower to other ambassadors, but this is because he thinks that the regulation of 1669 remained in force in Anne's reign. In the mid-eighteenth century the lower rate seems to have been paid only to two ambassadors to Russia and one to Venice.

[2] The payment of £10 a day in this rank to William Eden as envoy extraordinary and plenipotentiary to France is anomalous (46 *C.J.* 592). The appointment of a minister in this rank might be a tribute to the sovereign to whom he was accredited or a reward to the man appointed.

[3] A. C. Wood, *History of the Levant Company*, p. 134.

[4] Pell General Posting Books (E. 403 general reference) in P.R.O.

[5] Wood, *Levant Company*, pp. 177–8.

[6] *Infra*, p. 36.

until 'the day of his return into the presence'.[1] Not infrequently, however, specially favoured ambassadors and envoys were allowed to draw these allowances for months, and even years, after they had ceased to act. In such cases their duties at the foreign courts were discharged by proxy, i.e. by a lowly and poorly paid subordinate. One of the worst examples of this is William Norton, titular minister to the Swiss cantons from 1765 to 1783, who was only resident at his post for about three and a half years. When Catt, the *chargé d'affaires* he had appointed to do his work, died in 1776, Norton came back to Berne for a few days to appoint a successor, Louis Braun, and continued to draw his pay as minister until 1783. On the other hand, Godolphin refused to pay Stanhope as envoy after he had been defeated and taken prisoner at Brihuega.[2] Occasional pamphleteers tried to make capital out of the non-residence of the ambassadors at their posts. Thus the author of *The Present State of the Nation* wrote: 'Foreign affairs seem to have been almost entirely neglected for the last two years; the ambassadors appointed for the courts of Madrid, Turin and St. Petersburg were permitted to enjoy their salaries and their friends in England.'[3]

In addition to these 'ordinaries', during the time of their missions, most of these ministers received a regular 'extraordinary' allowance to cover certain expenses, such as postage, intelligence, and stationery.[4] This varied not only according to rank but to the court to which they were accredited.

Under Charles II the Committee for Foreign Affairs seem at first to have advised the king as to the suitable allowance for

[1] Irregular additions or perhaps merely anticipations of ordinary payments (H.M.C., *Bath MSS.*, i. 235) were occasionally made, as to the dukes of Shrewsbury and Hamilton in 1712, 'without account', *Cal. Treas. Books*, xxvi (1712), 427, 530, 532; cf. for a similar proposal affecting Matthew Prior H.M.C., *Bath MSS.*, iii. 216. I think George III was wrong when he wrote: 'The giving an audience to foreign ministers is now become customary. It used only to be to ambassadors' (*Correspondence*, ed. Fortescue, iv. 101).

[2] *Cal. Treas. Papers*, xxvii (1713), 62, 450.

[3] 3rd edition, 1768. There was in fact a gap of nearly eighteen months at Madrid, nearly five years at Turin, and over a year at St. Petersburg.

[4] See for example Ruth Clark, *Sir William Trumbull in Paris*, pp. 173–6. A considerable number of other accounts of this nature have been printed in *Cal. Treas. Books*. At a time of crisis in the Balkans Sir R. M. Keith at Vienna spent £300 on postages alone in the six months July 1773–January 1774 (Brit. Mus., Add. MSS. 35506, fos. 240–1).

equipage, weekly expenses and extraordinaries in each case. For extraordinaries the privy seal of appointment had usually authorized the Lord Treasurer to pay such extraordinaries as a secretary of state should sign: if this was not done the king's express command had been required for any payment under this head.[1] However, on 4 April 1669 the king approved at Whitehall a regular establishment covering equipage and ordinary allowances.[2] This scheme on 20 April 1669 was ordered to be entered in the Treasury books[3] and was intended to apply to all appointments. Ambassadors in ordinary were divided into two classes according to the court to which they were accredited. The higher class, to be sent only to France, Spain and the court of the Emperor, received £1,500 equipage and £100 a week, the lower £1,000 equipage and £10 a day. Ambassadors extraordinary differed from ordinary ambassadors only in equipage money, which was to be settled by his majesty on each occasion. Envoys and residents were similarly divided into two classes, the higher again being those sent to France, Spain and the court of the Emperor, with differing amounts for equipage and ordinary allowances. Only three months' pay at the beginning of the mission would be paid in advance; thereafter payment would be made at the end of each quarter. No bills of extraordinaries were to be allowed by the secretary of state until the minister had delivered an exact narrative of his negotiation, the state of the court at which he had resided and the characters of the ministers and other principal persons at that court.[4]

Later in 1669 by a Treasury minute of 10 December an attempt was made to regulate extraordinaries.[5] Certain expenses, such as the cost of hiring a private secretary, were excluded, and the foreign minister was required, if he was a commoner, to swear to the account, or if he was a peer to give it upon his honour and have his steward or secretary swear to it. Nevertheless on 21 January 1670 the question of 'presents to foreign ministers going hence and the rules about extraordinaries' was still being discussed

[1] *Cal. Treas. Books*, iii, part i (1669–72), 188.

[2] *Cal. Treas. Papers*, i (1557–1696), 6: printed in *Bolingbroke Correspondence*, ed. Parke, i. 114.

[3] *Cal. Treas. Books*, iii, part i (1669–72), 324.

[4] The influence of French practice may reasonably be inferred here.

[5] *Cal. Treas. Books*, iii, part i (1669–72), 169–70.

by the Treasury Lords, the Privy Council and the secretaries of state.[1] The order in Council of 1680 by which any expenditure in excess of an establishment must be authorized by the Treasurer before passing the Privy Seal[2] presumably increased Treasury control over extraordinaries.

Similar regulations controlling equipage and ordinary and extraordinary allowances were in force under James II. These elaborated a scale for diplomatic extraordinaries beginning with the envoy extraordinary to France at £200 a quarter and descending to the resident at Ratisbon at £50 a quarter. No other allowance for extraordinaries was to be made except by his majesty's particular order.[3] Combined and slightly simplified after the Revolution, these regulations provided the financial basis of the British diplomatic service from 1689 to 1789. In other countries such as Sweden diplomatic salaries and allowances were raised to meet the increased cost of living,[4] but in Britain such payments were frozen for more than a century.

From 1690 they were regulated by an order in Council, dated Whitehall 9 January 1690, on the basis of a report made jointly on 13 December 1689 by the secretaries of state and the Treasury Lords. Ambassadors to Spain, France or Holland were to receive £400 each a quarter, other ambassadors £300. Envoys and residents were grouped in three categories with extraordinary allowances varying from £150 to £75 a quarter, according to post, not rank.[5] With a few trifling variations, such as the increase of the allowance at Turin and Berlin from the original £75 to £100 a quarter, these figures remained unaltered until 1789. When new posts were created they were fitted into the scale at an appropriate level, e.g. the British envoy at Naples under George III received £400 and his colleague at St. Petersburg £600 a year.

According to this establishment of the extraordinaries only

[1] *Cal. Treas. Books*, iii, part i (1669–72), 347.

[2] S. B. Baxter, *Development of the Treasury 1660–1702*, p. 55.

[3] Copy in Add. MSS. 31150, fos. 23–5 (Strafford Papers).

[4] *Hist. de l'Admin. des Aff. Etrangères de Suède*, pp. 355–6.

[5] P.R.O., Warrants not relating to Money XIII, pp. 1–2, summarized in *Cal. Treas. Books*, ix, part ii (1689–92), 443, and perhaps more accurately in H.M.C., *Downshire MSS.*, i, part i. 330. No regular extraordinary allowance was paid to the ambassador at Constantinople (cf. *The Despatches of Sir Robert Sutton*, ed. Kurat, Camden Third Series, no. 78, pp. 49–50).

'heads of missions' were entitled to draw a fixed allowance, but special arrangements were sometimes made, chiefly for secretaries of embassy.[1] By the middle of the eighteenth century, however, secretaries of embassy had been included in the scheme, but when at the very end of our period secretaries of legation were first appointed they received no extraordinary allowance. Consuls also were excluded and the Lord Treasurer in 1705 ruled that 'a Consul has no title to make bills of extraordinaries. But if he has been at any expenses rel[ating] to prisoners of war he may make a bill of that and it shall be referred to the C[ommissioners] for sick and wounded.'[2] The Treasury's view does not seem to have found acceptance in the secretary of state's office. There is at least one document, apparently dating from Anne's reign, which gives the salaries of consuls at Algiers and Tripoli and adds 'besides which, they both make bills of extraordinaries'.[3] They continued to present bills for extraordinaries,[4] and in 1754 regular salaries and extraordinary allowances were fixed for the Barbary coast consuls.[5] In accordance with this arrangement the consul at Tripoli, for example, was receiving in the concluding years of our period a regular extraordinary allowance of £250,[6] but the Barbary coast consuls were exceptions. Some, however, were now being allowed to charge extra extraordinaries from time to time, e.g. Consul Merry at Madrid received £193 as the cost of illuminating his house on the accession of Charles IV of Spain in 1788 and Consul Magra obtained £218 in payment of his passage money to take up his post at Tunis.[7]

The order in Council of 1690 did not merely fix these quarterly extraordinary allowances: it laid down that no other extraordinaries were to be allowed save by the king's particular order or for 'such expenses as shall appear absolutely necessary in case there be not time to receive the King's direction therein'.

[1] H.M.C., *Bath MSS.*, iii. 24.

[2] *Cal. Treas. Books*, xx (1705–6), 108. In 1691, however, the Cabinet Council had allowed Consul Lodington's extraordinaries (H.M.C., *Finch MSS.*, iii. 404).

[3] P.R.O., S.P. 71. 11. It was easier to make bills for extraordinaries than to get them paid by the Lord Treasurer (*Cal. Treas. Papers* (1708–14), p. 557).

[4] E.g. Consul Hudson's from Algiers after his dispatch of 21 September 1720 in S.P. 71. 6.

[5] S.P. 71. 20 and 22, especially 22, fo. 683.

[6] 40 *C.J.* 328–33.

[7] 46 *C.J.* 598.

This enabled a very close check to be kept on any claims for extra extraordinaries, i.e. for expenses not covered by the fixed extraordinary allowance. Thus the whole 'extra extra' payments in 1784 and 1785 were not much in excess of £1,400 *per annum*.[1] Allowable claims under this head included cost of putting a diplomatist's household into mourning if there was a death in the royal family or travelling in the course of a minister's employment,[2] e.g. with the Saxon court on its biennial pilgrimage to Poland during the reigns of the Saxon kings in Poland or with the Russian court on its rare migrations from St. Petersburg to Moscow. If a minister were accredited simultaneously to two courts he might receive a special allowance for house rent.[3] Occasionally expenses incurred for secret service were also dealt with under this head;[4] more often it included presents to influential persons at the foreign court.[5] It should be noted that all

[1] 41 *C.J.* 645.

[2] But not, as a rule, journeys to and from the foreign court to which he was accredited. Thus when Lord Rochford put in a claim for his journey to Turin *via* Paris, the Lords of the Treasury recommended 'that no allowance be made for the future to ambassadors, envoys and ministers employed abroad for their journies to and from the respective courts to which they are commissioned, but in cases where His Majesty gives particular orders for a journey to be made for a particular service' (Minutes T. 29. 31, fo. 236, 7/11/49). Under William III and Anne, however, if the costs of these journeys were exceptionally heavy, claims were often allowed (*Cal. Treas. Books*, *passim*). Daniel Pulteney probably summed up the earlier practice not unfairly when he said, referring to claims for travelling charges and public mournings, that 'these extraordinary demands have, or have not, been allowed as the minister had friends at the Treasury, at least they have remained upon the foot of a pretension which may be obtained on some favourable turn' (H.M.C., *MSS. in Various Collections*, viii. 361). Under William III the decision whether to pay the bills drawn by a foreign minister was often made by the king himself (e.g. H.M.C., *Downshire MSS.*, i. 739), but this tended to become a matter for decision at the Treasury. In accordance with the Treasury Minute of 7/11/49 R. M. Keith received £500 as expenses of removal from Dresden to Copenhagen and Sir T. Wroughton £400 as equipage money on being posted from Warsaw to Stockholm (S.P. 88. 103 and S.P. 88. 114).

[3] *Cal. Treas. Books*, xxiv (1710), 535.

[4] More often this class of extraordinary payment seems to have been dealt with in the manner described in *Cal. Treas. Books and Papers*, iv (1739–41), pp. viii–ix.

[5] *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, xliii. 610–11, prints Hyndford's bill of extraordinaries, which largely consists of such items.

these payments had normally to be paid out of the diplomatist's own pocket and he was lucky to secure repayment from the Treasury within six months. Not until nearly the middle of the nineteenth century was any arrangement made to allow diplomatists to draw in advance, month by month, sufficient cash to provide for the bulk of their extraordinary expenses.[1] Until then most diplomatic agents must have (like Lord Clarendon) 'borrowed money from my bankers and paid interest for it'.[2] Matthew Prior might ask rhetorically: 'Who would be vexed about extraordinaries, whilst arsenic is but ninepence an ounce and a rope costs but three halfpence?', but to judge by the time and energy his colleagues devoted to securing payment of their extraordinaries few agreed with him.[3]

In addition to these ordinary and extraordinary allowances, ministers received on first appointment, and sometimes on transfer to another court, a sum of money for equipage, corresponding to the allowance for 'outfit' still paid under the 'Regulations for His Majesty's Foreign Service' at present in force. Ambassadors between 1689 and 1789 often received £1,500, but sometimes had to content themselves with £1,000.[4] An envoy extraordinary and plenipotentiary to the Emperor might get £1,200, but the normal equipage allowance for envoys was £500, and £300 for lower ranks, especially secretary of embassy and resident.[5] Equipage

[1] *Report from the Select Committee on the Diplomatic Service*, H.C. (1861) vi, question 540.

[2] *Ibid.*, question 1009.

[3] H.M.C., *Bath MSS.*, iii. 39.

[4] Lord Mahon, *History of England*, i. 30, argues that the only difference between an ambassador-extraordinary and an ambassador in ordinary was that the former received a sum for equipage determined by the sovereign on each occasion, whereas the latter received £1,500 or £1,000 according to the court to which he was accredited. This does not square with figures given in two notes about the pay of ambassadors in S.P. 94. 229. If these figures are correct, Charles II was much more generous than his successors. In 1663 Sir Richard Fanshaw is said to have received £4,000 at first setting out, and £4,000 a year for all expenses, while in 1666 the earl of Sandwich was paid for a year and ten months as ambassador at the rate of £8,000 a year. On the next appointment in the list after the adoption of a regular establishment (October 1671), that of the earl of Sunderland, the equipage money dropped to £2,500 and the familiar figure of £100 a week appears as his ordinary allowance.

[5] *Cal. Treas. Books*, xxvi (1712), 297; xxvii (1713), 259.

money was normally paid, along with an advance of ninety-one days' pay, before the diplomatist left England.[1]

Service was not pensionable, though occasionally lucky diplomatists for special reasons continued to draw pensions from civil list revenues long after they had left the diplomatic service. Manchester claimed that when he was ambassador at Venice he was allowed a pension of £1,500 a year.[2] The civil list accounts of the 1750's and 1760's printed in the *Commons Journals* show regular payments to Frederick Laurence, Charles Holzendorf and Brinley Skinner. Laurence was the subject of an address to this Society by Sir Richard Lodge[3] and in a sense was still employed actively abroad, but Holzendorf's last appointment had been as private secretary to Chesterfield while ambassador at The Hague in 1728–32 and Skinner's last appointment was as *chargé d'affaires* at Florence in 1733–4. Another anomaly of this kind is the payment of substantial sums to Solomon Dayrolle, the former minister to Flanders, who retired in 1757 from Brussels on the rupture of diplomatic relations with Austria but continued to receive payments of varying amounts until at least 1768–9. There is another slightly earlier case, that of John Burnaby, formerly minister to the Swiss Cantons, who received in 1752, two years after retirement, 30s. a day 'till provided for in his Majesty's service'.[4]

Later under George III ministers who had spent the best years of their lives abroad regularly received retiring allowances, usually of £1,000 or £1,200 a year. John Murray, who had been resident to Venice from 1754 to 1766 and then ambassador at Constantinople, was in 1770 promised a pension of £1,000 a year till suitable provision could be made for him.[5] Joseph Ewart

[1] The preceding paragraphs incorporate, with some modifications, the substance of my note in *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, xliii (1928), 606–11. Equipage was paid to officials other than diplomatists, e.g. Lord Chancellor Cowper received £2,000 on his appointment for equipage (*Diary*, ed. Rev. E. C. Hawtrey for the Roxburghe Club [Eton, 1833], p. 15). Speakers of the House of Commons received equipage money (46 *C.J.* 598) and also Lords Lieutenant of Ireland (*Cal. Treas. Books and Papers*, v (1742–5), 800).

[2] Manchester, *Court and Society from Elizabeth to Anne*, ii. 141–2. Cf. H.M.C., *Portland MSS.*, ii. 196: 'Mr. Stanhope will have a pension, being superannuated'.

[3] *Trans. Roy. Hist. Soc.*, 4th series, ix. 63.

[4] *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, xliii. 609.

[5] Weymouth to Murray, 30 November 1770, in S.P. 97. 46.

was compulsorily retired from his post at Berlin on a pension of £1,000 a year.[1] Sir James Porter after twenty-three years' service received a pension of £1,200 *per annum*.[2] Other examples from this period are quoted in my Historical Association pamphlet on *Scottish Diplomatists 1689–1789* and justify us in concluding that by the end of the eighteenth century the grant of a retiring allowance had become a regular practice in the case of diplomatists who had a sufficiently long and distinguished period of service abroad.[3] The act 22 George III c. 82 regulating the civil list expressly safeguarded by its eighteenth clause the right of the crown to grant such pensions to persons who had served the crown in foreign courts, provided the list of such pensions was laid before Parliament. Lord King in 1822 made a furious attack upon the whole system as it had developed under George III.[4]

In addition to these cash allowances and payments, there were often perquisites of considerable value. Ambassadors were entitled to a large quantity of white and gilt plate, estimated in the earlier part of the period to be worth £2,500. In Anne's reign they also received a cloth of state of crimson damask with gold and silver fringe, a chair, two stools, a footstool and a foot carpet 'as hath been usual on such like occasions' as well as a large Bible, prayer-books, altar cloth, etc., for the embassy chapel to an estimate of not less than £350.[5] By an order in council of 31 January 1668 the secretaries of state 'were to allow no ambassador to take official plate from the Jewel House unless he promised either to return it or buy it at the end of his mission',[6] but ambassadors, as a mark of particular royal favour, were some-

[1] Lodge, *Great Britain and Prussia*, p. 212. Cf. however Auckland, *Journal and Correspondence*, ii. 396, where it is stated at £1,500 gross yielding over £1,000 net.

[2] Larpent, *Turkey, Its History and Progress*, i. 10.

[3] Details in P.R.O., E. 403, 2680/1. Lists of such pensions are printed from time to time in appendices to *Commons Journals* and *Parliamentary Debates*.

[4] *Parliamentary Debates New Series*, vi. 1284 *et seq.*

[5] *Cal. Treas. Books*, xx (1705–6), 376. Cf. for a similar grant, *Cal. Treas. Books*, xxi (1706–7), 151, to the earl of Manchester. By the mid-eighteenth century rather more was usually estimated, e.g. three ambassadors, appointed between 1742 and 1745, all received plate valued at £3,100 and chapel furniture estimated at £408: *Cal. Treas. Books and Papers*, v (1742–5), 12, 378, 574, 576.

[6] Baxter, *The Devel. of the Treasury*, p. 13.

times allowed to retain for their own use the plate issued to them.[1] Even when no such grant had been made royal officials often had difficulty in recovering possession.[2] In 1690 and 1691 the deputy Treasury solicitor was suing certain peers for keeping the official plate loaned to them, though it is suggested that this was effectively a political prosecution, and as soon as Sunderland (one of the peers prosecuted) had made his peace with the king the proceedings against him were dropped.[3] The expense for plate averaged over £8,000 a year under William III[4] and plate (or an allowance in *lieu* thereof) continued to be issued to individual ambassadors until new arrangements were made after 1815. Ambassadors also received a framed portrait of the reigning sovereign as part of their state.[5]

Diplomatists of all ranks valued highly the privilege of exemption from customs duties which they habitually enjoyed and often abused. The extent of these exemptions varied at different courts.[6] The English practice, as stated by Godolphin to the Commissioners of the Customs in 1707, was to allow foreign ministers to import free of duty household goods, wearing apparel and equipage along with one tun of wine for ambassadors and two hogsheads for diplomatists of lesser rank; all other customable goods were to pay the usual duties.[7] It was however difficult to make certain that such goods were not subsequently sold at a handsome profit and there were continual disputes with the foreign ministers in London.

Cornelius van Bynkershoek gives the title 'the Merchant

[1] See for example *Cal. Treas. Books*, xxi (1706–7), 517 (grant of two services of plate to duke of Manchester, one as ambassador to Venice, the other as ambassador to France). Cf. Graham, *Stair Annals*, ii. 154.

[2] *Cal. Treas. Papers*, *1714–19*, 365, refers to a long list of ambassadors and others who in the thirty-three years up to 1718 had neither returned their plate nor secured a discharge.

[3] Baxter, *Devel. of the Treasury*, p. 248.

[4] *Parliamentary Papers*, H.C. (1868–9), xxxv. 593.

[5] *Cal. Treas. Books*, xx (1705–6), 298. Cf. *Correspondence of John Duke of Bedford*, ed. Lord J. Russell, iii. 200, and (for the nineteenth century) *Report of the Committee to inquire into the fees and emoluments of Public Offices*, H.C. (1837–8) *Accounts and Papers* XLIV, 118–19; Vera Watson, *A Queen at Home*, pp. 45–7.

[6] There is some information about Russian practice in *Buckinghamshire Despatches*, (Camden Third Series, no. 3), ii. 71, etc.

[7] *Cal. Treas. Books* xxi (1706–7), 346–7.

Ambassador' to one of his chapters 'because the profit of ambassadors from trade is now far larger than that of any others, since they do not pay any tariff on the merchandise which they pretend is necessary for their own use but which they afterwards sell at retail'.[1] Comparatively few British diplomatists engaged in business on this scale:[2] they were much more likely to try to abuse their exemption from customs duties to import goods cheaply for their friends, not to make a personal profit. Lord Hertford was indignant when the customs officials at Dover seized from one of the king's messengers some small presents which Lady Hertford was sending in the diplomatic bag to her friends in England.[3] The *Stair Annals* include references to commissions of this sort discharged by Stair while at Paris including six pairs of silk stockings for the duke of Argyll, a nightgown for the duchess of Marlborough and plate for her sister.[4] The duke of Manchester bought thousands of yards of damask and velvet at Venice to help furnish Blenheim and sent them home with his equipage, but he warned the duchess of Marlborough that she would have 'no trouble, till they arrive at the Customs house.'[5]

A diplomatist who successfully negotiated a treaty was entitled to expect a valuable present, not from his own master[6] but from the foreign sovereign. Such presents were rarely refused by the

[1] *De Foro Legatorum*, p. 69.

[2] Accusations of smuggling were frequently brought against British diplomatic agents, e.g. by Lady Mary Wortley Montagu against John Murray at Venice (Halsband, *Lady Mary Wortley Montagu*, p. 266), but they are usually unsupported by evidence which would satisfy a court of law.

[3] *Grenville Papers*, ii. 260. Similarly, when one of his messengers was suspended by the Lord Chamberlain for smuggling, Lord Strafford explained that his wife 'thought there was no harm in sending over a piece of silk to be made up in England into a manto and sent her back again to wear here' (H.M.C., *Portland MSS.*, ix. 402).

[4] J. M. Graham, *Stair Annals*, i. 290–4, cf. ii. 136, 445.

[5] Manchester, *Court and Society from Elizabeth to Anne*, ii. 388–9.

[6] Harrington while Secretary of State ruled that 'it was an absolute unprecedented thing for our court to make (after the custom of the German courts) any pecuniary acknowledgments to our own ministers upon the conclusion of any treaty by their means, how beneficial soever that treaty might be to the public; but threw out at the same time that a riband, or some such mark of distinction was the usual and proper method taken by our court to distinguish such ministers' (*Bedford Correspondence*, i. 126–7).

destined recipients.[1] Thus the duke of Bedford on signing the treaty of Paris received from Louis XV a 'snuff-box with the royal portrait set in diamonds in red enamel' costing nearly 34,300 livres,[2] while the duchess was given the magnificent service of Sèvres porcelain which is now on exhibition at Woburn.[3] Similar presents were given to the duke and duchess of Manchester in 1783.[4]

Junior officials who brought a treaty, after signature, to the king could however expect a handsome gift in cash from their own sovereign.[5] When Abraham Stanyan negotiated a loan of £150,000 by the Canton of Berne to the British government he received the commission of ½%, amounting to £750, 'usual amongst merchants', while the grateful Lord Treasurer assured him that his services in this matter would always make the Treasurer justly distinguish him by forward payments of his allowances.[6] There are occasional hints elsewhere that some diplomatists received preferential treatment[7] and that diplomatists who made themselves unpopular with the authorities would suffer delay in receiving their arrears or might not be paid in full.[8]

Another method which optimistic diplomatists sometimes used to supplement their income was the one often described in the eighteenth century as the infamous practice of stockjobbing.

[1] One example of refusal by the French diplomatists Dubois and Pecquet to accept presents from George I valued at £3,000 and £500 respectively is mentioned in Graham, *Stair Annals*, ii. 367, 370.

[2] Joan Evans, 'The Embassy of the Fourth Duke of Bedford to Paris, 1762–1763', *The Archaeological Journal*, cxiii (1957), 151.

[3] *Bedford Correspondence*, iii. 232.

[4] *Correspondence of George III*, ed. Fortescue, vi. 452.

[5] The attachés who brought the definitive treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle to Hanover and to London each received £1,000, while the bearer of the definitive treaty of Paris at the end of the Seven Years War 'touched his thousand at the Treasury without any deductions: he is in great spirits' (*Bedford Correspondence*, i. 558 and iii. 212). Earlier Prior received 200 guineas 'for the glad tidings of peace [of Ryswick] which [he] brought' to the Lords Justices (H.M.C., *Bath MSS.*, iii. 167).

[6] *Cal. Treas. Books*, xxiv (1710), 248–9, 349.

[7] H.M.C., *Bath MSS.*, iii. 32; H.M.C., *Portland MSS.*, ix. 330; Coxe, *R. Walpole*, iii. 546.

[8] Halsband, *Lady Mary Wortley Montagu*, p. 94. Wortley claimed £9,000 on his return from Constantinople and asserted that his refusal to support the Peerage Bill cost him £4,000 of this and other advantages which he had been promised, but his story is quite unsupported.

There were obvious reasons why men whose official position gave them access to early and confidential information likely to affect stock exchange prices should not use this information to make a personal profit. According to Horace Walpole, however, most of the foreign ministers at London 'except the prince of Masserano, the Spanish ambassador, followed that dirty trade'.[1]

The ambassadors at Constantinople by extending their protection—at a price—to Jews, Armenians and other aliens made a considerable profit. According to one of them 'the fees for this protection . . . formed an important item in the emoluments of the ambassador'.[2]

At some courts, a valuable present could be expected from the foreign sovereign at the end of each mission.[3] Lord Forbes received 6,000 roubles and a diamond ring valued at £1,100 from the Tsaritsa,[4] Buckingham received a gift of tapestry from Catherine II during his mission to Russia[5] and Robert Liston was given at the end of his Spanish mission amongst other gifts a copy of the Infant Don Gabriel's *Sallust* (which could not be bought) and proposed to smuggle it (as a gift to Edinburgh University Library) through the British Customs House in the diplomatic bag.[6] Probably the most expensive gifts were given to the earl of Macclesfield on his mission to Zell and Hanover to present to the Electress Sophia a copy of the Act of Settlement and invest the elector with the Garter.[7] These are stated to have exceeded £7,000 in value. When the customary present was not given, acrimonious protests followed.[8]

The custom of paying at least part of the expenses of a resident diplomatist apparently still survived in the early years of our period at one or two continental courts, including Brussels[9] and Constantinople.[10] Davenant after quarrelling with the Tuscan

[1] Walpole, *Journal of the Reign of George III*, ii. 9–10.

[2] Larpent, *Turkey, Its History and Progress*, i. 6. Details are to be found in Add. MSS. 38229, fos. 156–61.

[3] See the curious references in Auckland, *Journal and Correspondence*, iv. 277–8, 280–1, to a grossly indecent painting given by the king of Sweden as a parting gift to Lord Henry Spencer.

[4] H.M.C., *Report II, Appendix*, p. 215.

[5] *Buckinghamshire Despatches* (Camden Third Series, no. 2), i, p. viii.

[6] National Library of Scotland MS. 3943, fo. 216.

[7] Cole, *Historical and Political Memoirs*, p. 414.

[8] E.g. H.M.C., *Polwarth MSS.*, iii. 65–6.

[9] H.M.C., *Portland MSS.*, v. 232. [10] Wood, *Levant Company*, p. 134.

authorities proposed to remove to Genoa, to which state he was also accredited, and, trying to obtain the approval of the secretary of state, used the argument that he would then qualify for a pension from the Genoese republic.[1] Special services highly appreciated by the foreign government might win for a British diplomatist a foreign title such as count of the Holy Roman Empire, a foreign decoration or an addition to his coat of arms. Thus Malmesbury received, for his services in establishing a British-Prussian-Dutch alliance, a peerage from his own government, from the king of Prussia the addition of the Prussian eagle to his arms and from the Stadtholder his motto 'Je maintiendrai'.[2] Queen Elizabeth I is said to have remarked: 'I would not have my sheep branded with any other mark than my own, or follow the whistle of a strange shepherd';[3] but it was not until 1834 that a rule was introduced prohibiting (*inter alios*) diplomatists and consuls from receiving any presents from a foreign government.[4] Such a regulation could, however, be evaded, as it was when, on the conclusion of a convention regulating the Sound dues on ships trading to the Baltic, the king of Sweden gave a porphyry vase to the wife of the British diplomatist who had negotiated the treaty.[5] Palmerston three years earlier had abolished the practice of giving presents of this character to foreign diplomatists at London on conclusion of treaties and at the end of their missions.[6]

It is clear also that British diplomatists were occasionally offered substantial sums as bribes by foreign governments: at other times they had the chance of disbursing considerable sums at foreign courts and possibly retaining a proportion in their own hands.[7] The difference between legitimate perquisites and malversation was not always as clear as it might have been.

[1] S.P. 79. 9, despatch of 17/1/16.

[2] *Malmesbury Diaries and Correspondence*, i, p. xiii.

[3] Satow, *Guide to Dip. Practice*, p. 269.

[4] Hertslet, *Recollections of the Old Foreign Office*, p. 175.

[5] *Old Days in Diplomacy*, by the eldest daughter of the late Sir E. C. Disbrowe, p. 203.

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 175.

[7] See for example a curious conversation between Lord Rochford and the Russian ambassador at London in which Rochford states that Goodricke, the envoy to Sweden, is trustworthy in every way except with money. Russia was pressing Britain to bribe the anti-French party in Sweden: Martens, *Recueil des Traités conclus par la Russie*, ix (x), under date 1772.

A few examples, chosen from the middle years of the eighteenth century, will show the actual sums received in cash by men at the top of the diplomatic tree. Albemarle as ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to France drew well over £7,000 a year and in addition drew another £2,000 a year as Groom of the Stole.[1] Keene's earnings towards the end of his embassy to Spain averaged nearly £7,000 a year. Hanbury-Williams, a mere envoy to Saxony-Poland, until appointed in 1755 to the Russian embassy, averaged over £5,000 a year between 1752 and 1758. Joseph Yorke, son of the Lord Chancellor and minister plenipotentiary to the United Provinces, was drawing between £3,000 and £4,000 in the middle 1750's and in 1761–2 his pay as envoy extraordinary and plenipotentiary to The Hague and as ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to the Congress of Augsburg reached a total in excess of £8,500.[2]

It should be remembered that these sums, large as they seem, were not intended as remuneration for services rendered to the crown but rather as an expense allowance to defray the costs necessarily incurred in representing the crown abroad.[3] The first duty of an ambassador, if he would do honour to his master, was to keep an open table.[4] 'The minister's table ought to represent the grandeur of his master by making known the honourable salary he allows him.'[5] Lord Chesterfield also believed that 'to

George III on this occasion authorized Goodricke to draw up to £15,000 'provided that sum can defeat the attempts of the K[ing] of Sweden' (*Correspondence*, ed. Fortescue, ii. 384). Successive agents at St. Petersburg received large sums to be spent at their discretion in winning the favour of the Russian ministers. The earl of Cadogan in 1721 received 50,000 crowns from the king of Prussia to be used as bribes at Vienna (S.P. 80. 43, despatches of 5 March and 15 March), while John Methuen while ambassador to Spain received over £200,000 from his own government for various purposes connected with the war. Stormont, while ambassador at Paris, was accused by an enemy of embezzling secret service money (Fife Papers in Aberdeen University Library).

[1] One of his predecessors, Stair, had been given the colonelcy of a regiment of dragoons 'because his Royal Master foresaw that his salary could not defray his expences': *The Life of John Earl of Stair by an Impartial Hand*, (London, 1748), p. 169.

[2] These figures are taken from 32 *C.J.* 466–603.

[3] For this reason a proposal to arrest an envoy's wages for debt was described as 'not very practicable', (H.M.C., *Finch MSS.*, ii. 301).

[4] Wicquefort, (English trans.), *The Ambassador and his Functions*, pp. 207–8.

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 208.

keep a good table, and to do the honours of it gracefully and *sur le ton de la bonne compagnie*, is absolutely necessary for a foreign minister'. [1] Thus the elder Horace Walpole, we are told by his biographer, though by nature and habit strictly economical, acted with a laudable spirit during his embassies. 'Even in his absence a regular table was maintained, and the same establishment (except in his equipages) kept up as when he was present. He was accustomed to say that the best intelligence is obtained by the convivial intercourse of a good table.' [2]

In some continental states appointment to an embassy was almost regarded as indirect taxation of over-wealthy subjects. This was never the case in Britain, but the expenses must often have exceeded the income.[3] The position in Britain was similar to that in France, where Montesquieu commented: 'Les ambassadeurs de France sont tres mal payés; le Roi est un géant qui se fait représenter par un nain,' [4] and Pecquet in his *Discours sur l'art de Négocier* stated that 'tout homme occupé d'un désir excessif de fortune ou de richesse doit renoncer à l'emploi de Négociateur'.[5] Matthew Prior referred to himself and his diplomatic colleagues under William III as working journeymen 'sent [abroad] to preach politics as the Apostles were on a better errand, without purse or scrip'.[6] Hans Stanley, applying for a diplomatic job in 1761, wrote to Pitt: 'Those who know the nature of these commissions, cannot be ignorant, that they are not to be sought from any hope of emolument.' [7] James Harris

[1] *Letters*, ed. Bradshaw, i. 421.

[2] Coxe, *Memoirs of Lord Walpole*, ii. 455–6. Cf. the story in H.M.C., *Egmont Diary*, iii. 240, of the member of parliament who, when Walpole drew a distinction between the dinners he gave in England as plain squire Walpole and those he gave abroad in his ambassador's function, remarked: 'Then I will dine no more with the squire but with the ambassador.'

[3] The most convincing evidence for this relates to the early nineteenth century. The F.O. memorandum as to the Diplomatic Expenditure (11 May 1822) is supported by statements of actual expenditure by some of the leading diplomatists of the day (F.O. 83. 10). But as early as 1713 when Bolingbroke proposes Lord Bingley as ambassador to France he adds: 'His estate will bear it, and his obligations to the Queen will, if she requires it, I suppose, make him willing.'

[4] *Œuvres Complètes*, ed. R. Caillos, i. 1445.

[5] P. 20 of the Paris 1737 edition.

[6] H.M.C., *Bath MSS.*, iii. 15.

[7] *Chatham Correspondence*, ii. 118.

claimed to have diminished his private fortune by £20,000 during his fourteen years in the diplomatic service.[1]

Under James II Sir William Trumbull wrote from Paris that unless special arrangements could be made 'it is impossible for me to live here according to my Character without being ruin'd in my little fortune'.[2] And towards the end of our period Sir R. M. Keith, after some years at Vienna, wrote in 1774:

> It is a melancholy truth that with more marks of favour conferred upon me than I ever looked for, or merited—with a more grateful and contented disposition than most people are blessed with—I find myself unavoidably verging into beggary; because my place, my principles, my duty towards the King and my countrymen, lay me under *indispensable obligations* of expense which are, from their nature and from inveterate custom, carried to a pitch which exceeds my appointments, and swallows up the last shreds of my private fortune. I live amongst great Austrian lords, whose tables are costly and splendid, and ambassadors from great courts, whose appointments are at least the double of mine. I neither cope with, nor ape any body in magnificence; but the minister of England in the first court of Europe must live not only hospitably, but handsomely, especially if he has frequently a score of young fellows of the first fashion of his country to introduce into the best company of the capital.[3]

At certain other courts the entertainment of British visitors added to the already high expenses.[4] It was on this ground that Sir William Porter solicited his recall from Brussels in 1765 although he had been able to live comfortably and even make a handsome profit at Constantinople on a previous mission.[5] Even at the Constantinople embassy profits were on the decline. There a main source of income was the sale of *barats* or patents of protection, entitling the holders to claim the benefit of the English capitulations to Armenians, Jews and Greeks, which may

[1] *Malmesbury Diaries and Correspondence*, i. 457–8.

[2] Clark, *Trumbull in Paris*, p. 103.

[3] *Memoirs and Correspondence of Sir R. M. Keith*, i. 477–8.

[4] Lord Preston, while ambassador to France, entertained the duke of Northumberland, by the King's order, for nearly six months and expected an extra allowance. H.M.C., *Report VII*, *App.*, p. 303.

[5] Larpent, *Turkey, Its History and Progress*, i. 10.

well have brought in £2,000 or £3,000 a year and was not ended until 1809.[1] Stair, writing from Paris in 1715, claimed that 'my house here and my stables, my servants' wages and board-wages and clothes, will do more than exhaust all my appointments . . . and then there will remain my table and all my own personal expenses and extraordinaries[2] to be taken out of my own funds'.[3] According to his biographer at the end of his mission 'his fortunes and estates were much impaired by the debts he had contracted, which his government allowances as ambassador were never sufficient to liquidate'.[4] He himself admitted however that his debts were in part due to gaming and stockjobbing.[5] An earlier ambassador to France, Jersey, calculated that he spent £12,000 in eight months.[6]

The second earl of Marchmont when offered a diplomatic commission remarked that

> my father had undone himself in such, and had been kept abroad till all his friends were dead . . . Upon [Lord Chesterfield's] saying that no gentleman could save himself in such a commission, I told him, that I could not undertake one, if I had not something beside my own estate to trust to, if the Treasury did not pay.[7]

'I would not ruin myself and my family,' Marchmont told Bolingbroke, 'to come home here forgotten, to walk about soliciting a Scots pension.' [8] Occasionally expenses were reduced by exchange of houses in Paris and London by the French and British ambassadors,[9] but this was rarely practicable. It should be remembered that the figures given are gross payments and liable to substantial deductions. It was estimated in 1821 that 14% of the equipage, ordinary and extraordinary allowances was deducted at the Treasury and Exchequer. The Privy Seal office also collected fees from each payment made to a diplomatist,

[1] Wood, *Levant Company*, pp. 135, 191.
[2] Graham, *Stair Annals*, i. 391, shows that these amounted to nearly £2,000 for the June–September quarter of 1716.
[3] *Ibid.*, i. 266; cf. *ibid.*, ii. 98.
[4] *Ibid.*, ii. 159.
[5] *Ibid.*, ii. 60, 98.
[6] H.M.C., *Bath MSS.*, i. 224.
[7] *Marchmont Papers*, i. 90.
[8] *Ibid.*, i. 95.
[9] *Bedford Correspondence*, ii. 94.

though these are possibly included in the 14%.[1] Moreover, to secure more prompt payment diplomatists got into the habit of appointing foreign office clerks and others to act as their agents in collecting the sums due to them,[2] and these agents were entitled to a commission, fixed by Castlereagh in 1816 at 1% on ordinary allowances.[3] It is also possible, though I am far from certain about this, that diplomatic salaries may have been subjected to land tax, as they certainly were later on to income tax.

Other deductions of a less official kind included the cost of supplying friends at home with articles for which the country in which they had their residence was famous. Envoys to Saxony, for example, were continually being dunned for Meissen porcelain, while those in Italy were sometimes expected to pick up cheaply old masters for their friends. Horace Walpole's sister Lady Townshend expected him to bring her back some 'linnen' from The Hague.[4] Apart from a pound of ultramarine for the king, Sir William Trumbull on his return from Paris received orders from various acquaintances for 'a night dress of Point de Paris for the head of my Lady Jeffreys', books on history, geography and morality, sealing-wax and sand, and 'three pairs of small French scissors'. It was also suggested that he should smuggle into England '3 or 4 suits of hangings and a velvet bed' which

[1] F.O. 83. 10. Thus fees confirmed by a Treasury minute of 30 November 1782 included a charge of £6 7s. on all quarterly allowances to ambassadors or to envoys and plenipotentiaries and of £3 3s. 6d. on each bill of extraordinaries of £100. (Pensions to foreign ministers were charged at the rate of £1 1s. per cent. up to £500). On first appointment each ambassador paid £88 10s. to the Foreign Office fee fund, with an additional £21 for the chief clerk's own use. These and many other details will be found in *First Report of the Committee appointed to inquire into the fees and emoluments of Public Offices*, H.C. (1837–8) *Accounts and Papers*, XLIV.

[2] An early example is to be found in H.M.C., *Bath MSS.*, iii. 33–4.

[3] *Report of the Committee . . . into the fees and emoluments of Public Offices*, H.C. (1837–8), XLIV, 114–23. F.O. 366. 375 contains a mass of papers relating to the question of these agency charges in the nineteenth century, although as early as 1786 the Committee on Fees and Gratuities in Public Offices had reported that such fees are 'improper, liable to abuse and ought to be discontinued'. As late as 1865–7 five foreign office clerks showed an average net profit of £422 from such charges. See also a report by the Secretaries of State, 23 February 1795, in F.O. 366. 542.

[4] *An Honest Diplomat at The Hague*, ed. J. J. Murray, p. 349.

Lord Montague had at Paris and bring home with him the son of Sir Thomas Exton.[1]

Some diplomatists, such as Lord Tyrawley, who wrote that the king had appointed him to Lisbon 'as a good thing in order to retrieve his private fortunes',[2] expected to make money out of a diplomatic career, but I do not think many succeeded in this, though John Laws, a writing master, was reputed to have made his fortune as resident at Brussels during the Spanish Succession War.[3] According to his official biographer, Sir James Porter did well for himself at Constantinople and acquired financial independence, partly by collecting perquisites and partly by 'the judicious economy he established in his household. . . . He soon discovered that the Turks viewed any ostentatious display on the part of an ambassador not only with indifference and habitual apathy, but sometimes with contempt.'[4] Far more typical was Benjamin Keene, who wrote to Bedford from Madrid in 1750: 'My circumstances, after a life of some labour and disagreeable passages, are in every respect much the same as when I made the first steps into it. My appointments, and much else, have always been expended in procuring that regard here which was necessary for his majesty's service.'[5]

Some idea of the preparations required at the outset of an important embassy may be obtained from the list of the earl of Stair's suite when he made his public entry as ambassador to congratulate Louis XV on his accession to the throne.[6] One of Stair's predecessors on a similar occasion paid £450 in gratuities alone to the officers and servants of his Most Christian Majesty.[7] One of James II's envoys to Louis XIV, Sir William Trumbull, took with him a household of forty persons.[8] Albemarle, a later ambassador, was accompanied by a suite of forty-one persons.[9] But the record seems to be held by Portland, who took with him to France in 1698 eighty servants and ninety carriage and

[1] Clark, *Trumbull in Paris*, p. 165; H.M.C., *Downshire MSS.*, i. 219, etc.
[2] S.P. 89. 37, letter dated 22 September 1730.
[3] *An Honest Diplomat at The Hague*, ed. Murray, pp. 47–8.
[4] Larpent, *Turkey, Its History and Progress*, i. 6.
[5] *Bedford Correspondence*, ii. 62–3.
[6] *The Life of Stair by an Impartial Hand*, pp. 199–208. A less pretentious ambassadorial entry is described in H.M.C., *Polwarth MSS.*, iii. 95–6.
[7] *Cal. Treas. Books*, xxvii (1713), p. 296.
[8] Clark, *Trumbull in Paris*, p. 18. [9] *Bedford Correspondence*, iii. 93–4.

saddle horses.[1] Sometimes the Treasury made a special payment towards the cost of an ambassador's public entry. Holdernesse, for example, received £200 from the Treasury towards this expense during his embassy to Venice.[2]

Admittedly a suite on the scale adopted by Stair was exceptionally lavish; but as Callières puts it, 'a well-ordered household served by reliable and well-mannered persons is a good advertisement, both of the ambassador and of the country whence he comes.'[3] For this reason the suite of a Genoese diplomatist was laid down by the law of the Republic and any diminution in state would mean a reduction in his emoluments.[4] When Wortley and his wife went on their celebrated mission to Constantinople Wortley's suite included a secretary, treasurer, resident chaplain, three dragomen, a Turkish scribe, and a guard of Janissaries to protect his family in public against fanatical Moslems. The embassy was staffed by a retinue of servants, most of them Greeks and Armenians hired at Constantinople.[5] Sir William Trumbull's luggage included

> a coach, a chaise and twenty horses . . . two trunks full of plate, nine boxes full of copper and pewter vessels, fifty boxes filled with pictures, mirrors, beds, tapestries, linen, cloth for liveries, and kitchen utensils, . . . seven or eight dozen chairs and arm chairs, twenty boxes containing tea, coffee, chocolate, wine, ale and other provisions; four large and three small cabinets; six trunks and six boxes with Sir William and Lady Trumbull's apparel [and] forty boxes, trunks, bales, valises, portmanteaux containing the belongings of Sir William's suite.[6]

The key appointment was undoubtedly that of secretary. In British practice secretaries of embassy were separately paid by the crown; but envoys and ministers had to provide secretaries

[1] C. K. Eves, *Matthew Prior*, pp. 103–4.

[2] *Cal. Treas. Books and Papers*, v (1742–5), 672, 803.

[3] *De La Manière de négocier avec les Souverains* (trans. A. F. Whyte), p. 97.

[4] V. Vitale, *La Diplomazia Genovese*, p. 13. Cf. Pecquet, pp. 71–2.

[5] A. C. Wood's article in *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, xl (1925), 538–41; Halsband, *Lady Mary Wortley Montagu*, p. 74. This was in accordance with the traditional practice (H.M.C., *Downshire MSS.*, i. 224).

[6] Clark, *Trumbull in Paris*, p. 19.

out of their own emoluments.[1] A well-qualified private secretary might well cost his employer up to £100 a year in cash, plus of course his board and lodging.[2] A good cook, at least at some courts, we are told, was as important as a good secretary. It was a common practice for an eighteenth-century British diplomatist to take with him one or more young men, friends or connexions of his own, who acted as unpaid attachés and gained experience of diplomatic practice in the hope of being appointed to a diplomatic post. Sometimes the more menial servants were the domestic servants employed in England by the diplomatist in his private capacity and brought out with him from home;[3] but they usually had to be recruited from the available labour at the foreign capital. Such recruits were often politically unreliable: others occasionally acted as spies for other governments. Thus our ambassador at Constantinople, John Murray, from 1766 to 1775 had his whole correspondence, ciphers, etc., betrayed to the French by one of his servants, a Pole.[4] Harris claimed that at St. Petersburg no person in his household was too insignificant to escape the temptation of a bribe from his opponents and that 'when he left his secretary, he used to lock him up, not from mistrust of his honesty, but of his leaving the door of the room open'.[5] It was a commonplace in diplomatic text-books that the bad conduct of diplomatists' servants was responsible for many incidents.[6] A surprising number of these can be attributed to *odium theologicum*, though this was often sharpened by more material motives.

'Vivant noblement et dans l'abondance, mais sans profusion ridicule', the good diplomatist 'ne contracte point de dettes'.[7] This, I fear, represents theory rather than practice when we

[1] For the institution of secretaries of legation, see *supra*, p. 23.

[2] Occasionally a great nobleman's chaplain acted also as his secretary, e.g. Ayerst to Lord Strafford in 1713 (*Bolingbroke Correspondence*, ii. 376).

[3] Government messengers were often chosen from the menial servants of noblemen with foreign office influence, e.g. Arthur Young's *Autobiography*, ed. M. B. Edwards, p. 45, and *Old Days in Diplomacy*, by the eldest daughter of Sir E. C. Disbrowe, p. 41.

[4] Information from Dr. M. S. Anderson.

[5] *Malmesbury Diaries and Correspondence*, i. 458.

[6] E.g. Pecquet, p. 130. In extreme cases such incidents produced an actual rupture of diplomatic relations, e.g. H.M.C., *Polwarth MSS.*, ii. 558.

[7] Pecquet, p. 131.

attempt to apply it to British diplomatists. Quite apart from the problematical adequacy of the rates of pay to meet expenditure, payment both of ordinaries and extraordinaries was often much in arrear. As early as 1694 there were difficulties and Sir Paul Rycaut from Hamburg agreed with his correspondent Trumbull that 'the best way to have the foreign ministers paid is to have a vested fund appointed for their maintenance'.[1] Rycaut himself at this time had to accept payment of some of the arrears due to him by tallies on the excise leaving £1,127 16s. 3d. still outstanding.[2] 'My tallies I cannot sell under 30% loss', wrote Prior in 1696,[3] while arrangements were made to pay off some of the arrears due to Manchester by weekly instalments.[4] By 1697 William III's inadequate civil list was pledged for two years ahead. This was not due to extravagance, but to the deliberate refusal of the house of commons to vote him money sufficient to carry on the government.[5] The result was that he died owing his foreign ministers £14,502 2s. 5d. This sum was included in his civil list debts, the great bulk of which was never paid.[6]

The position in the closing years of Anne's reign was for a time even worse. Writing to Lord Strafford in August 1713, Bolingbroke states: 'I neither have received, nor expect to receive anything on account of the journey I took last year by her Majesty's order [into France]; and, as to my regular appointments, I do assure your Lordship I have heard nothing of them these two years.'[7] When this was the position of powerful secretary of state, the plight of lesser men can readily be appreciated. Christian Cole, secretary at Venice, claimed in November 1713 that his pay was four years in arrear.[8] John Molesworth, envoy extraordinary to Tuscany, also in November 1713, claimed that his pay was three years in arrear and pointed out that he would be unable to leave his post until he received payment. The moment he took leave of the grand-ducal court he would lose his

[1] H.M.C., *Downshire MSS.*, i. 449–50.
[2] *Ibid.*, i. 455.
[3] H.M.C., *Bath MSS.*, iii. 86. Cf. *ibid.*, iii. 95, for tallies at 45%.
[4] Manchester, *Court and Society from Elizabeth to Anne*, ii. 66.
[5] *Cal. Treas. Books*, introduction to vols. xi–xvii (1695–1702), pp. xxiii–xxvi.
[6] *Cal. Treas. Books*, introduction to vols. xi–xvii (1695–1702), p. xli.
[7] *Bolingbroke Correspondence*, ii. 466. [8] S.P. 99. 60.

diplomatic immunity and his many creditors would descend upon him to the dishonour of the British crown.[1]

In 1708 the Lord Treasurer 'cleared the arrears of all the foreign ministers by "tallies of Pro" upon the tin, bearing no interest',[2] and later in the reign the crown raised £30,409 15s. 5d. out of loans made by the merchants commissioned to sell her Majesty's tin abroad and used this to defray some of the arrears due to foreign ministers[3] instead of paying the Cornish tinmen with it. So desperate was the position of some foreign ministers that they begged for payment even in tallies.[4] The Treasury accounts confirm the arrears when they show a jump in the payments made to foreign ministers from £38,798 in 1713 to the staggering figure of £158,874 in 1714. Most of the latter sum represents the liquidation of arrears. This was due to the passing of the act 12 Anne c. 11 which authorized the queen to raise a loan of £500,000 serviced by a charge on the civil list for the next thirty-two years towards meeting arrears due to the Queen's servants, tradesmen and others.[5] Since it was most improbable that the queen would live for another thirty-two years, the loan had also to be charged upon her hereditary revenues. A lottery was thus raised and from the proceeds the Lord Treasurer was preparing to make certain payments to our diplomatic representatives abroad in December 1713 which would still leave them with their salaries six months in arrear; but would restore most of them to solvency.[6] Amongst the payments to be made was £1,036 to James Dayrolle, late resident at The Hague, for the period 25 December 1710 to 26 May 1712 when his employment had ended, and £6,385 to the executors of John Wych, late envoy to the Hanse Towns, etc., being arrears from 25 December 1709.

[1] S.P. 98. 23, despatch of 21 November 1713 and authorities cited in Horn, *British Diplomatic Representatives 1689–1789*, p. 79. There are occasional cases of diplomatists leaving unpaid debts behind them, e.g. *Polwarth MSS.*, i. 37, 408, 416.

[2] H.M.C., *Portland MSS.*, iv. 502.

[3] *Cal. Treas. Books*, xxiii (1709), 357. Sir Lambert Blackwell received payment of arrears due to him in 1710 by tallies on the [Queen's] tin (*Cal. Treas. Books*, xxiv (1710), 22).

[4] H.M.C., *Portland MSS.*, ix. 300, 321, 330.

[5] *Statutes of the Realm*, ix. 771–81. The details are best explained by W. R. Ward in *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, lxxii (1957), 333.

[6] *Cal. Treas. Books*, xxvii (1713), 450–1.

There is ample evidence that Wych (as one might expect) was heavily in debt, and when he died in October 1713 £50 was paid by the Treasury to give him decent burial.[1] In spite of this special parliamentary arrangement to meet arrears of pay, Queen Anne died heavily in debt to her servants abroad.[2]

A similar but less acute state of affairs is shown on the death of George I when the corresponding figures are £41,348 (1727) and £113,998 (1728),[3] and similar financial crises occur later in the period. Towards the end of George I's reign it was 'doubted whether any of the [foreign] ministers will receive any pay, until the Parliament meets, when 'tis thought they will raise a new fund'.[4] Robert Trevor, at the end of his mission to The Hague in 1746, warned Pelham:

> I must only apprise you betimes that when I have obtained my letters of revocation, I shall not be able to make use of them here, before I am enabled by suitable remittances to provide for the dignity of the King's Commission, and indeed the safety of my own person, the lowness of my private purse putting it morally out of my power to supply the vuide of my arrears; and consequently to comply with the immemorial custom established here . . . of all Public Ministers, even from the most indigent Courts, challenging before they quit this residence all their creditors by public beat of drum for three days running to serve any pretension to their charge.[5]

It is however worth while to point out that arrears in pay were no novelty to diplomatists. Danby had calculated in 1673 that 'Embassadors and envoys are behind 34,000[l]'.[6]

> 'Duns come so boldly,
> King's money so slowly',

as Matthew Prior found in the reign of William III.[7] And as late as 1822 a memorandum relative to the more speedy issue of the

[1] *Cal. Treas. Books*, xxvii, 62–3, 390, 438.
[2] *Cal. Treas. Papers* 1714–19, 60–1, refers to a list of debts due by the crown to foreign ministers on the day of Anne's demise.
[3] *Parliamentary Papers*, H.C. (1868–9) XXXV, Part II.
[4] H.M.C., *MSS. in Various Collections*, viii. 376.
[5] H.M.C., *14th Report, Appendix IX* (Trevor MSS.), p. 154.
[6] A. Browning, *Danby*, iii. 13.
[7] H.M.C., *Bath MSS.*, iii. 90.

salaries due the King's ministers employed abroad[1] states that these salaries are 'so irregularly issued from the Treasury that no banker will accept their drafts . . . owing to the want of some regulation, although the pensions are paid up to the 10th of October, the ministers' salaries are in arrear since the 5th of April'. On this the author of the memorandum comments: 'The ministers employed abroad are the last whose salaries should be left in arrear—the very nature of their employment requires that their credit should be preserved as sacred as their persons.'

[1] In F.O. 83. 10, dated 8 November 1822.

THE SOCIAL ORIGINS AND PROVENANCE OF THE ENGLISH BISHOPS DURING THE REIGN OF EDWARD II

By Miss K. Edwards, Ph.D., F.R.Hist.S.

READ 8 MARCH 1958

DURING the last twenty or twenty-five years medieval historians have been much interested in the composition of the English episcopate. A number of studies of it have been published on periods ranging from the eleventh to the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries.[1] A further paper might well seem superfluous. My reason for offering one is that most previous writers have concentrated on analysing the professional circles from which the bishops were drawn, and suggesting the influences which their early careers as royal clerks, university masters and students, secular or regular clergy, may have had on their later work as bishops. They have shown comparatively little interest in their social background and provenance, except for those bishops who belonged to magnate families. Some years ago, when working on the political activities of Edward II's bishops,[2] it seemed to me that social origins, family connexions and provenance might in a number of cases have had at least as much influence on a bishop's attitude to politics as his early career. I there-

[1] *E.g.* R. R. Darlington, 'Ecclesiastical Reform in the late Old English Period', *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, li (1936); D. Knowles, *Episcopal Colleagues of Archbishop Thomas Becket*, Cambridge, 1951; C. R. Cheney, *From Becket to Langton*, Manchester, 1956; M. Gibbs and J. Lang, *Bishops and Reform, 1215–72*, Oxford, 1934; E. L. Smith, *Episcopal Appointments and Patronage in the Reign of Edward II*, Chicago, 1938; K. Edwards, 'The Political Importance of the English Bishops during the Reign of Edward II', *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, lix (1944), and 'Bishops and Learning in the Reign of Edward II', *Church Quarterly Rev.*, cxxxviii (1944); J. R. L. Highfield, 'The English Hierarchy in the Reign of Edward III', *Transactions of the Roy. Hist. Soc.*, 5th ser., vi (1956); W. A. Pantin, *The English Church in the Fourteenth Century*, Cambridge, 1955; A. H. Thompson, *The English Clergy and their Organization in the later Middle Ages*, Oxford, 1947.

[2] *Cf. Eng. Hist. Rev.*, lix, 311–45.

fore collected information about the origins and provenance of these bishops. I now think that a rather more careful and complete study of this subject might throw further light not only on the political history of the reign, but on other problems connected with the character and work of the English episcopate. There is a general impression that in England in the later middle ages the bishops' ties with their dioceses were becoming less close, and that they were normally spending less time in diocesan work than their predecessors in the thirteenth century. This has sometimes been attributed to the increasing number of royal clerks and other outsiders provided to bishoprics by the pope in accordance with the king's wishes, and to the much more frequent custom of translating bishops from one see to another.[1] An ambitious man, appointed from outside, having no local family connexions, and hoping soon to be translated to a richer see, might well not have the same interest in his diocese as his predecessors who had normally spent the rest of their lives in it. It would therefore be interesting to know how far bishops in Edward II's reign (the period when papal provisions were beginning to replace elections by the local cathedral chapters as the normal method of appointing to bishoprics) had their roots in their dioceses.

For other purposes, too, a more precise knowledge of the social character of the English episcopate, particularly in the later middle ages, might be of value. It might be interesting to be able to compare it with that of the episcopate in other European countries. In Germany there has been much interest in the exclusive high aristocratic and local character of the medieval bishops and cathedral clergy, which was so firmly established that it was quite uninfluenced by papal provisions in the later middle ages. Schulte, Stutz and their followers in Germany, and Professor Barraclough in England, suggested that these aristocratic and local influences in the German church were responsible for most of the ecclesiastical abuses in Germany throughout the middle ages and a main cause of the decline of the medieval church there.[2] Böhmer went farther, maintaining that features of medieval

[1] *Cf.* Pantin, *op. cit.*, pp. 11–14, 24–5, 54–5; A. H. Thompson, *op. cit.*, pp. 14–38, 41–5.

[2] The views of German historians of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries on these subjects were conveniently summarized by Professor G. Barraclough in his *Papal Provisions* (Oxford, 1935), pp. 38–65. *Cf.* also

church government such as the *Eigenkirchenwesen* or proprietary church and aristocratic influence on the church were less German than Germanic, and as native to the Anglo-Saxon and Frankish kingdoms in certain periods as to Germany.[1] Other historians have suggested that aristocratic influences, which were certainly powerful in the church in some parts of Europe in both the early and later middle ages, were feudal in origin rather than Germanic or racial.[2] Professor Hay has recently maintained that the medieval church in Europe as a whole was socially at one with the order of lay society; that the higher clergy, especially the bishops and abbots, were normally of gentle birth and all too often related to the magnates around them by blood, and that they were separated by a great social gulf from the humble lower clergy. He thinks that the medieval church did not normally offer a career open to talent through which the low born could rise to positions of power and responsibility.[3] Professor Douglas in his study of the Norman episcopate during the thirty years before the Norman Conquest of England has shown in detail how the ruling Norman dynasty and secular aristocracy then used the Norman episcopate almost as an additional endowment for their own families; and how as a result the Norman bishops formed a close-knit aristocratic group, whose principal filiations could be easily displayed within the scope of two restricted and connected pedigree sketches.[4] In France and Italy in the later middle ages the general impression gained from pages of the *Gallia Christiana*, from Ughelli's *Italia Sacra* and from the many local studies of individual bishops, chapters and dioceses,[5] is that the episcopate was normally drawn from a wider social circle than in Germany,

F. R. Lewis, 'Prelates and Nobles in the Rhineland: a Church Province in the Thirteenth Century', *History*, xxii (1937), 193–200.

[1] H. Böhmer, 'Das Germanische Christentum. Ein Versuch' in *Theologische Studien und Kritiken*, lxxxvi (1913), 165–280.

[2] Barraclough, *op. cit.*, pp. 48–9.

[3] D. Hay, *From Roman Empire to Renaissance Europe* (London, 1953), pp. 69–71.

[4] D. Douglas, 'The Norman Episcopate before the Norman Conquest' in *Camb. Hist. Jour.*, xiii (1957), 102–6.

[5] *Gallia Christiana in provincias ecclesiasticas distributa*, ed. P. Piolin, Paris, 1870 *et seq.*; F. Ughelli, *Italia Sacra* (Venice, 1717–22), 10 vols. For a guide to local studies in France, see V. Carrière, *Introduction aux Etudes d'histoire ecclésiastique locale* (Bibliothèque de la Société Ecclésiastique de la France), 3 vols., 1934 *et seq.*

although aristocratic bishops may have formed a majority on the bench in some periods and in some regions. On the other hand a recent study of Scottish graduates from 1340 to 1410 suggests that in this period nearly all Scottish bishops were graduates and that there were very few aristocrats among them.[1]

In England the 'mixed' social character of the medieval episcopate has perhaps seemed too obvious to need detailed investigation. There has, of course, been detailed investigation of the social origins of individual bishops, and these studies have provided clear evidence that in every period of the middle ages from the Norman Conquest onwards, men from humble or middle class families were appointed to the bench and provided the country with some of its most distinguished leaders in church and state. One thinks of Roger of Salisbury and Thomas Becket in the twelfth century; of Stephen Langton, Robert Grosseteste or Robert of Winchelsea in the thirteenth century; of William Melton, John Stratford or William of Wykeham in the fourteenth century; of Henry Chichele, Thomas Kempe or Thomas Beckington in the fifteenth century; of Thomas Wolsey and Thomas Cranmer in the sixteenth century. The problems and theories of German historians about the evil results of aristocratic dominance in the medieval church have seemed remote to English historians, for conditions in England were so different. Smaller dioceses, more settled political conditions, the strength of the royal power, the different development of feudal society in England had combined to make the growth of anything resembling the prince bishoprics of medieval Germany almost an impossibility. Recently, however, interest in the development of 'bastard' feudalism and the growing political power of the magnates in England in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries has suggested that further investigation at least of the magnate element in the late medieval episcopate might be desirable. Mr. Pantin has remarked that between about 1350 and 1480 twenty bishops drawn from the high aristocracy (i.e. from families of dukes or earls) were appointed to the bench, and that many of them held key positions at important sees such as Canterbury, York, London and Lincoln. He thinks that they formed the most important element in the episcopate by

[1] D. E. R. Watt, 'Scotsmen at Universities between 1340 and 1410, and their subsequent Careers'. Unpublished Oxford D.Phil. thesis, 1957, chapter 3.

the end of the fourteenth century, and asks how far this indicates that the power of the crown over the church was weakening and that of the magnates increasing.[1] Are there any indications that such a development had already started in Edward II's reign, and how far was the presence of aristocratic bishops in the episcopate then balanced by bishops drawn from other classes of English society?

In Edward II's reign it is clear that contemporaries were aware of the growing power of the magnates. The author of the *Vita Edwardi Secundi* warned the English courtiers against looking down upon the barons, for he said, 'the magnates are a chief constituent of monarchy, and without them the king cannot attempt or accomplish anything of importance'.[2] Moreover, he and many other chroniclers of the time as well as the king and (naturally) the magnates thought that high birth was very desirable in a bishop.[3] It was a qualification stressed in letters to the pope and cathedral chapters recommending candidates for bishoprics. Men of the magnate class were said to be both more useful to the king and kingdom and more effective rulers of their dioceses than simple clerks without powerful family support. Humble birth was not necessarily condemned in a bishop, but, other things being equal, an able clerk of high birth might have an easier path to promotion to a bishopric than a new man of obscure origin. Far stronger, however, than contemporary opinion that bishops should if possible be of noble birth, was the demand that they should be local men. Foreigners especially were disliked.[4] Candidates for election who were *alienigenae et conventui ignoti* were condemned by the monastic chroniclers,[5] and few

[1] Pantin, *op. cit.*, pp. 22–5.

[2] *Vita Edwardi Secundi Monachi Cuiusdam Malmesberiensis*, ed. and trans. N. Denholm-Young (Nelson's Medieval Texts, 1957), p. 28.

[3] *E.g. ibid.*, p. 45; *Chronica Monasterii de Melsa* (Rolls Ser.), ii. 329; *Flores Historiarum* (Rolls Ser.), iii. 169; *Foedera*, ed. T. Rymer (Record Commission, 1818), II, i. 319, 325, 406, 407, 411, 414–15, 425; *Parliamentary Writs*, ed. F. Palgrave (Record Commission), II, ii. 619; II, iii. 520.

[4] For the prejudice against foreigners, see *e.g.* Adam Murimuth's remark that Louis de Beaumont, bishop of Durham, was *claudus utroque pede, sicut sunt multi Francigenae* (*Continuatio Chronicarum* (Rolls Ser.), p. 25).

[5] *E.g. Historiae Dunelmensis Scriptores Tres* (Surtees Soc.), p. 93. It is interesting to notice that John XXII pointed out to Edward II that there was no reasonable cause for revoking John Stratford's provision to the see of

cathedral chapters were ready to welcome candidates from distant dioceses, who were unknown to them.

It is here proposed to investigate the two problems of the bishops' family connexions and provenance together. An attempt has been made to discover the social origins not only of the *ingenui* among Edward II's bishops, whose families are usually well known, but also of the new men; to find out roughly the proportion of bishops drawn from the different ranks of English society; and to see how far both aristocrats and lesser men had had early local connexions or special interests in the dioceses which they were appointed to rule.

One of the most surprising results of the investigation is to show how very small and unimportant the aristocratic element in the episcopate of the early fourteenth century was. Louis de Beaumont, bishop of Durham, was the only one of the forty-five bishops of the reign connected with royal or comital families. He was a Frenchman (one of the only two foreigners in the episcopate), a son of Louis de Brienne, vicomte of Beaumont in Maine, younger son of John de Brienne, king of Jerusalem and emperor of Constantinople, and so related through his grandmother Berengaria to Eleanor, first wife of Edward I.[1] His brother Henry married one of the co-heiresses of John Comyn, earl of Buchan.[2] Louis is thought to have come to England in Edward I's reign.[3] He seems to have obtained his bishopric through the influence at court of his brother Henry and their sister Isabella,[4] but he himself did not play a leading part in the reign, either in church or state.

No sons of the great earls became bishops, and sons of the

Winchester, since he was *non alienigena, non extraneus* (*Foedera*, II, i. 533). Both king and archbishop, in recommending candidates for bishoprics, were careful to stress any local qualifications their candidates might have (*e.g. ibid.*, II, i. 319; *Registrum Roberti Winchelsey, Cantuariensis Archiepiscopi*, Canterbury and York Soc., p. 514).

[1] G. E. Cockayne, *Complete Peerage*, ed. V. Gibbs and others, ii. 59 n.

[2] *Ibid.*, ii. 60. He was later known as earl of Buchan, but his son did not inherit the title.

[3] *D[ict.] N[at.] B[iog.]*, *s.v.* Beaumont, Louis.

[4] *Cf. Parl. Writs*, II, ii. 619; II, iii. 520, 791. Henry was a knight in Edward II's household as prince and king, and Isabella was in the service of Queen Isabella. She married John de Vescy, of the important northern and Irish baronial family of Vescy (see articles by Tout in *D.N.B.* on members of the Vescy family).

barons or lesser magnates numbered only five or one-ninth of the episcopate. The best known is probably Antony Bek, the magnificent and warlike bishop of Durham, whose father was Walter Bek, lord of Eresby in Lincolnshire.[1] Antony belonged to the older generation of the bishops and owed his appointment to Edward I. He was prominent in the early years of Edward II's reign, but died in 1311. Two younger bishops, Thomas of Cobham, bishop of Worcester, and Henry Burghersh, bishop of Lincoln, have attracted a good deal of notice from contemporary and later historians. They were both from the south-east of England and were related to each other. Thomas was a son of John of Cobham, lord of Cobham and Cowling in Kent, and a younger brother of Henry of Cobham, a constable of Dover Castle and warden of the Cinque Ports.[2] He was one of the most distinguished scholars in the episcopate, and both a royal clerk and a good diocesan bishop, who took little part in politics after his appointment. His younger kinsman Henry Burghersh, a son of Robert of Burghersh, lord of Burwash in Sussex,[3] was on the other hand one of the leading political bishops in the later years of the reign and in the early years of Edward III's reign. He apparently owed his appointment to the influence at court of his uncle, Bartholomew Badlesmere,[4] the Kentish baron and steward of the royal household, and supported him unreservedly against the king in the crisis of 1321–2.[5] Of the two other magnate bishops, Gilbert Segrave, bishop of London, a younger son of Nicholas Segrave, lord of Segrave in Leicestershire,[6] hardly ruled long enough to show his quality. David Martin, bishop of St. David's throughout the reign, was the only magnate bishop

[1] *Complete Peerage*, ii. 89; C. M. Fraser, *A History of Antony Bek, Bishop of Durham, 1283–1311* (Oxford, 1957), pp. 4–10.

[2] *Complete Peerage*, iii. 338–54; E. H. Pearce, *Thomas de Cobham, Bishop of Worcester, 1317–27* (London, 1923), pp. 2–5.

[3] *Complete Peerage*, ii. 425–7; *D.N.B.*, *s.v.* Burghersh. Bishop Cobham wrote that Henry was 'michi sanguinis proximitate et sincera dilectione coniunctus', *Register of Thomas de Cobham, Bishop of Worcester* (Worc. Hist. Soc.), pp. 46–7.

[4] *Foedera*, II, i. 414–15. *Cf. ibid.*, pp. 406–7, 411, 425; *Vita Edwardi Secundi*, p. 105; *Adae Murimuth Cont. Chron.*, p. 31.

[5] *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, lix. 335–6, 340.

[6] *Complete Peerage*, x. 603 *et seq.*; *D.N.B.*, *s.v.* Segrave. The bishop and the contemporary theologian of the same name were not identical.

closely connected through his family with the diocese which he was to rule. He was the fifth son of Nicholas FitzMartin, lord of Cemaes in Pembrokeshire, who held extensive lands in South Wales, Somerset and Devon, and a great-grandson of a Welsh princess.[1] Unfortunately little evidence has survived of his activities in Wales or England.

A rather larger group of bishops was drawn from families of knights or landed gentry, men not necessarily of knightly rank, but of a roughly similar status. Among the more important of the knightly families were the Yorkshire Hothams, from whom the present holder of the Irish barony descends. John Hotham, bishop of Ely, was apparently not a member of the main Scorborough line of the Hothams, but was closely related to it, and was born at the hamlet of Trehouse in Hotham, Yorkshire.[2] He seems to have been introduced to the royal service by his uncle William Hotham, the Dominican, who was made archbishop of Dublin. John became a prominent exchequer clerk, and doubtless gained his bishopric through royal influence. The origin of William Greenfield, archbishop of York, is more obscure. He owed much to his powerful kinsmen, Godfrey Giffard, bishop of Worcester, and Walter Giffard, archbishop of York, who paid for his education at Oxford, collated him to his first benefices in the south-west and Yorkshire and introduced him to the chapter at York. The family connexions of the Giffards were in the south-west of England. They were closely related to the Gloucestershire baronial family of the Giffards of Brimpsfield, who were also kinsmen of Archbishop Greenfield. It is thought that the archbishop may have come from a family of Greneviles which has left its memory in the name of Compton Greenfield in Gloucestershire, where they were subtenants of the bishop of Worcester.[3] Another bishop who probably owed his promotion chiefly to his family connexions was Stephen Gravesend, bishop of London, great-nephew of Richard Gravesend, bishop of Lincoln in the thirteenth century,

[1] H. C. Maxwell-Lyte, 'Burci, Falaise and Martin', *Proc. Somerset Archaeological and Natural Hist. Soc.*, 4th ser., v. 20; *Complete Peerage*, viii. 530–8.

[2] P. Saltmarshe, *History and Chartulary of the Hothams of Scorborough* (York, 1914), chapters xvii and xviii; *cf. Cal. Close Rolls*, *1327–30*, p. 207.

[3] *Register of William Greenfield, Archbishop of York*, *1306–15* (Surtees Soc.), v, pp. liv–lix.

and nephew of Richard Gravesend, bishop of London. These bishops all came from the knightly family of Gravesend in Kent,[1] and Stephen's election was doubtless made easier by his family's influence in the cathedral chapter of St. Paul's. The earls of Hereford and Pembroke and other magnates are said to have urged his consecration.[2]

Two more sons of families of knights or landed gentry were elected to bishoprics by cathedral chapters in the south-west. Walter Stapeldon, a doctor of canon and civil law, the later treasurer of Edward II, had been a leading member of Exeter cathedral chapter before his election. He was a son of William and Mabel of Stapeldon in Devon. His elder brother Richard was lord of the manor of Stapeldon and was returned to parliament as a knight of the shire for Devon and Cornwall.[3] Walter de Haselshaw, archdeacon and dean of Wells, who was elected to the see of Bath and Wells, came from Helshaw in the parish of Stoke upon Tern in Shropshire, where, towards the end of the thirteenth century, he held the manor of Helshaw as mesne tenant under Theobald de Vernon.[4] Several of his kinsmen held land near by in Shropshire, and were active in the neighbouring counties of Gloucester and Somerset.[5] Roger de Martival, on the other hand, had no family connexions in or near his diocese of Salisbury. He was probably chosen as bishop by his southern cathedral chapter mainly because of his academic distinction and his ecclesiastical work in Lincoln diocese, and because his Oxford friend and predecessor at Salisbury, Simon of Ghent, had early in his episcopate made him a member of the chapter.[6] But Roger

[1] *Rotuli Ricardi de Gravesend, Diocesis Lincolniensis, 1260–79* (Canterbury and York Soc.), pp. i–vi; *D.N.B.*, *s.v.* Gravesend; C. Moor, *Knights of Edward I* (1929 *et seq.*), ii. 141.

[2] *Annales Paulini* in *Chronicles of the Reigns of Edward I and Edward II* (Rolls Ser.), i. 284.

[3] *Register of Walter de Stapeldon, Bishop of Exeter, 1307–26*, ed. F. C. Hingeston-Randolph (London, 1892), pp. viii–ix, 301; *D.N.B.*, *s.v.* Stapeldon; *Parl. Writs*, II, iii. 1456.

[4] R. W. Eyton, *Antiquities of Shropshire*, viii. 69; *cf.* 236.

[5] *Ibid.*, pp. 62, 67–9, 85, 275; *Cal. Inq. post mortem*, vi. 39; vii. 283, 710; *Parl. Writs*, II, iii. 979. Other kinsmen held benefices and offices at Wells cathedral after his appointment as bishop (*Hist. MSS. Comm.*, *Wells*, i. 191, 250, 541, 544).

[6] *Cf. Church Quarterly Rev.*, cxxxviii. 59, 71–2, 74; J. le Neve, *Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae*, ed. T. D. Hardy, ii. 32, 49, 59–60, 126, 160–1, 168;

may have owed something to his family's connexions. He and his father before him held the manor of Noseley in Leicestershire from the earls of Leicester. His father had been high steward to Simon de Montfort, whose earldom in Roger's time had passed to Thomas of Lancaster.[1] It may be significant that 1315, the year of Roger's election, was during the period of the reign when Thomas of Lancaster's influence was strongest at court. At Oxford also, Roger may have received help from members of the Leicestershire baronial family of Segrave, who were neighbours of his family at home; his master was at one time Dr. Gilbert Segrave.[2]

Eight more bishops perhaps came from families of landed gentry, although the origin of some is doubtful. Some were connected with knights; others were probably of a rather lower status.

It is interesting to find that the four who had spent their early lives or careers mainly as cathedral clergy were all probably local men. Henry of Woodlock, the Benedictine monk and prior of Winchester cathedral priory who was elected bishop of Winchester, was born at Marwell, only a few miles from Winchester, where the bishops had had Woodlocks as their tenants for two centuries. They belonged to a family of landed gentry with many ramifications in the southern counties, especially in Hampshire.[3] The family of John Dalderby took its name from the village of Dalderby near Horncastle in Lincolnshire, where it held the advowson of the church. John as a young man was rector of Dalderby and later held the advowson.[4] He rose as a scholar at Oxford and through ecclesiastical work in Lincoln diocese. He was resident chancellor of Lincoln cathedral when he was elected

Lincoln Cathedral Statutes, ed. H. Bradshaw and C. Wordsworth, i. 83, 122, 263, 319, 322, 328, 340; *Register of Simon de Gandavo, Bishop of Salisbury 1297–1315* (Canterbury and York Soc.), ii. 568.

[1] G. F. Farnham and A. H. Thompson, 'The Manor of Noseley', *Trans. Leics. Archaeological Soc.*, xii, pt. ii (1922), 219–25.

[2] *Register of Thomas of Corbridge, Archbishop of York, 1300–04* (Surtees Soc.), ii. 130.

[3] *Registrum Henrici Woodlock, Diocesis Wintoniensis, 1305–16* (Canterbury and York Soc.), i, pp. v–vi. The Bishop's name in religion was Henry of Marwell.

[4] *Rotuli Ricardi de Gravesend, Dioc. Linc.*, pp. 20, 36; *Rolls and Register of Oliver Sutton, Bishop of Lincoln* (Lincoln Record Soc.), i. 58–9, 185, 203.

to be bishop of the see.[1] Two other graduates who worked together as archdeacons in London diocese and were in turn chosen as deans of St. Paul's cathedral and bishops of London, may have had a similar social background. Richard of Newport was possibly connected with a local family holding lands in Essex, Hertfordshire and Middlesex, which perhaps derived its name from Newport in Essex.[2] Ralph Baldock's name suggests a connexion with Baldock in Hertfordshire, where the author of the *Annales Paulini* says that his brother, Thomas Catel, held property.[3] Ralph was also probably related to Robert Baldock, Edward II's able and unpopular chancellor, who became a canon of St. Paul's during his episcopate and was one of his executors.[4]

The royal clerks in this group seem on the other hand to have had few early connexions with their dioceses. John Sandall, the exchequer clerk, who gained the bishopric of Winchester, came from Yorkshire. His father is thought to have been William of Wheatley who held the manor of Wheatley near Doncaster which included Sandall as one of its members.[5] John of Droxford, the wardrobe clerk who became bishop of Bath and Wells, derived his name from the village of Droxford in Hampshire. He was collated by Bishop Woodlock to the rectory there, and men of the same name held land and benefices in the county.[6] But the extensive

[1] *Church Quarterly Rev.*, cxxxviii. 59, 67, 69, 71–2; *Hist. MSS. Comm., 12th Rept.*, app. ix, p. 568; Schalby, 'Lives of the Bishops of Lincoln', *Giraldi Cambrensis Opera* (Rolls Ser.), vii. 212.

[2] *Cf. D.N.B., s.v.* Newport, Richard; *Parl. Writs*, II, iii. 1227; *Cal. Pat. Rolls, 1324–7*, p. 349.

[3] *Chronicles Edw. I and II*, i. 314–15.

[4] T. F. Tout, *Chapters in the Administrative History of Medieval England* (Manchester, 1920–33), ii. 299. A William of Baldock held a knight's fee in Landbeach, Cambridgeshire, in 1302–3 (*Feudal Aids*, i. 148), and Bishop Ralph, when archdeacon of Middlesex, bought property near by in the city of Ely (F. R. Chapman, *Sacrist Rolls of Ely*, i (1907), p. 156). His deed was witnessed by Richard Newport, who was then archdeacon of Colchester.

[5] *Register of John de Sandale, Bishop of Winchester, 1316–19* (Hampshire Record Soc., 1897), pp. xvii–xx, lxiv. *Cf. Cal. Inq. p.m.*, vi. 130. His niece married into the knightly family of the Willoughbys of Nottinghamshire.

[6] Tout, *Chapters*, ii. 16; *Parl. Writs*, II, iii. 786; *Registrum Johannis de Pontissara, Dioc. Wint.* (Canterbury and York Soc.) i. 68; *Reg. Henrici Woodlock, Dioc. Wint.*, i. 564, 590; ii. 728, 745, 779, 804, 822, 844–5, 953.

estates in Hampshire, Somerset and Surrey inherited by his brother Philip on his death[1] had probably been mostly acquired by John in the course of his successful career in the royal administration and as bishop.

Some of the most puzzling genealogical problems are connected with two prominent bishops appointed in Edward I's reign: Walter Langton, his famous treasurer, who was bishop of Coventry and Lichfield from 1296 to 1321, and John Langton his chancellor, bishop of Chichester from 1305 to 1337. Walter was said to have started life as a poor man, and to have been from his youth upwards in Edward's household; while John, on his appointment as chancellor in 1292 was described as a simple clerk of chancery.[2] The surname Langton is so common that it has usually been thought highly dangerous to suggest ties of kinship between them, or between one of them and any of the other prominent ecclesiastics of the same name in the thirteenth century.[3] The tradition that Walter was a nephew of the high-born William Langton of Rotherfield, dean of York, is evidently false.[4] Walter was however connected with the knightly family of Peverel, for it is stated in his inquisition *post mortem* that Sir Robert Peverel, knight, was his brother, and that Edmund,

[1] *Cal. Inq. p.m.*, vii. 160–1.

[2] *Chronicle of Walter of Guisborough* (Royal Hist. Soc., Camden 3rd Ser., lxxxix, 1957), p. 382; *Foedera*, I. ii. 956; Tout, *Chapters*, ii. 15–16, and *Place of the Reign of Edward II in English History* (1936 edn.), p. 54; *Annales de Dunstaplia* in *Annales Monastici* (Rolls Ser.), iii. 373; *cf.* G. O. Sayles, 'The Household of the Chancery' in *Scottish Hist. Rev.*, no. 98 (1928), 111.

[3] But *cf.* J. Raine, ed. *Register of Walter Grey, Archbishop of York* (Surtees Soc.), pp. 122–3 n.

[4] The dean had a nephew Walter Langton, who was presented to the church of Keighley, 30 July 1272 (*Reg. Walter Giffard, Archbishop of York*, p. 35), of which he was deprived in 1294 (*Register of John le Romeyn, Archbishop of York* (Surtees Soc.), i. 138). This Walter cannot be the Walter Langton who was rector of Askham Richard from 1268, when he was not beneficed elsewhere (*Reg. Walter Giffard*, pp. 27, 29), holding it until his death, 23 Aug. 1319 (Register of William Melton, fo. 636 in *Miscellanea* (Yorkshire Arch. Soc., Record Ser.), i. 138), and who in turn must be distinguished from Walter Langton, the bishop of Coventry and Lichfield, who died in 1321. I owe these references to the kindness of Sir Charles Clay, who has been working on the history of William Langton, dean of York, for his forthcoming volumes on the dignitaries and prebendaries of York for the period ending 1307.

Robert's son, was his heir.[1] Walter therefore should probably be included in the group of bishops drawn from families of knights or landed gentry. Probably he was called Langton because he was born at Church Langton in Leicestershire, where he still held three acres of land at his death.[2]

More recently an interesting piece of evidence has been discovered by Professor G. O. Sayles, which suggests that John Langton also may have had more aristocratic family connexions than has hitherto been supposed. This is a letter from Katherine Paynel to John Langton, the king's chancellor.[3] In it she describes herself as his liege and former mother (*sowe lyge e jadis mere*), and reminds him how, since their first acquaintance she has looked after herself and her children with great difficulty. But they are very kind and humble to her; all her sons have some means of their own, and her daughter will be able to take counsel of them when she wishes. Her youngest son Stephen Paynel has begged her to send him to court and place him in service or company where he would be able to learn *savoir faire* and manners. She therefore asks John to place him there. Katherine's identity would seem to be insoluble unless the phrase *jadis mere* means something other than actual mother. If it means stepmother, godmother, foster mother, mother-in-law or some other relationship, she may possibly have been Katherine, daughter and co-heiress of Adam de Periton, who died in 1296 as the widow of Sir John Paynel, knight.[4] It is

[1] *Cal. Inq. p.m.*, vi. 195–6; *cf. Cal. Pat. Rolls, 1321–4*, p. 237. The details relating to Castle Ashby given by W. Farrer, *Honors and Knights Fees* (London 1924), ii. 335–6, also show a close connexion between them.

[2] *Cal. Inq. p.m.*, vi. 196; *cf. ibid.*, iv. 260.

[3] Public Record Office, Ancient Correspondence, xxvii, no. 113. I owe this reference to the kindness of Professor Sayles. The letter is printed below, p. 78.

[4] Katherine Periton could not have been John's actual mother, because of the descent of the manor of Rampisham, Wiltshire. This was her own inheritance, and if John Langton were her son by a first husband he would have been her heir and the manor would have passed to him on her death, but it passed to the Paynel issue: C. T. Clay and W. Farrer, *The Paynel Fee* in *Early Yorkshire Charters* (Yorks. Arch. Soc., Record Ser., 1939), vi. 13–16. Perhaps the phrase means only that John had been brought up in her household. The only other Katherine of this period mentioned in histories of the Paynel family, viz. Katherine who was Philip Paynel's possible first wife, was probably too young to have been John's mother (*cf. ibid.*, pp. 1, 15).

interesting to find that Bishop Walter Langton had a Paynel tenancy in Scawby, Lincolnshire;[1] also that he was succeeded in his prebend of Fridaythorpe at York by John Langton, the chancellor.[2] Was this a coincidence, or were they possibly brothers?[3] And was John also born at Langton in Leicestershire? In 1287 an inquisition *ad quod damnum* found that there would be no damage to any person if the king gave leave to his clerk John de Langton to enclose a certain way lying within his court at West Langton in Leicestershire.[4] Was this king's clerk the future bishop and was he also the John Langton who was Bishop Walter's executor?[5]

Even if all the bishops so far discussed could be described as belonging to families of magnates, knights or landed gentry (and it is doubtful if some of them can be) they number only twenty, or less than half the episcopate. It is remarkable to find how many bishops were drawn from middle class and humble families, both in the towns and in the countryside.

A surprisingly large number were born in or near towns or cities and include some of the most distinguished members of the episcopate. Two at least were sons of important burgesses, whose position was quite as substantial as that of some of the landed gentry. John Stratford, bishop of Winchester 1323–33 and archbishop of Canterbury 1333–48, was son of a leading burgess in

[1] *Cal. Inq. p.m.*, vi. 197. This land was also held by Edmund Peverel at his death (*ibid.*, vii. 256).

[2] *Cal. Pat. Rolls. 1292–1301*, p. 223. The prebend is not here named as Fridaythorpe, but it is certain from other evidence to be published shortly by Sir Charles Clay that it was Fridaythorpe. John held the prebend until he became bishop of Chichester in 1305 (*ibid., 1301–07*, p. 378).

[3] In 1294 two recognizances of Robert de Morteyn, knight, to a John de Langeton described him as brother of a Walter de Langeton (P.R.O., K.R. Mem. R. 22 Edw. I, E.159/67, mm. 71d, 72), but no evidence has been found to prove that these men were the future bishops. For another John Langton, see below, n. 5.

[4] P.R.O., Inquisitions ad quod damnum, File xi, 15 Edw. I (C. 143/11/3, m. 1). J. Nichols, *History and Antiquities of the County of Leicester* (London, 1798), II, iii. 663, and J. H. Hill, *History of Langton* (Leicester, 1867), pp. 18–19, 55, describe this John as rector of Church Langton, but I can find no evidence to substantiate their statements. Their accounts of the Langton family are very confusing.

[5] *Cf. Cal. Close Rolls, 1288–96*, p. 316; *1296–1302*, p. 478. There was, however, another John Langton, appointed a chamberlain of the exchequer in 1323, who had previously been a clerk of Bishop Walter Langton (Tout, *Place of . . . Edw. II*, p. 313).

Stratford on Avon, and rose in the service of king and archbishop as an able lawyer and diplomat. Tout writes of the tribe of kinsmen who strengthened his position as Lancastrian leader under Edward III. He found positions in church and state for brothers, cousins and nephews; two became bishops, and, with John, were liberal in benefactions to their native town.[1] This spectacular rise to power of so many members of the family seems to have been mainly due to John's energy and ability. An equally impressive rise to power in both church and state was that of John Salmon, the Benedictine monk and prior of Ely, who became bishop of Norwich, chancellor of England, a leading negotiator and diplomat, and a man trusted alike by king and barons. He belonged to a family whose members had been hereditary goldsmiths to Ely priory since the twelfth century. His father was Salomon the goldsmith, a man of wealth in Ely, and the holder of landed property outside the city.[2]

Two or three other Benedictine bishops probably came from towns near or fairly near their cathedral priories. Richard de Kellaw, formerly a monk and subprior of Durham, was upbraided when bishop of Durham by Henry de Beaumont for having neither means nor family connexions to help him in defending his diocese against the Scots.[3] He took his name from Church Kelloe, about six miles from Durham, where he was probably born. Members of his family seem to have been burgesses of Durham, and are also found holding land outside the city.[4]

[1] Tout, *Chapters*, iii. 41–2; *D.N.B.*, *s.v.* Stratford; *Vict. Co. Hist. Warwickshire*, ii. 19, 123–4; iii. 247, 269, 278.

[2] F. R. Chapman, *Sacrist Rolls of Ely*, i (1907), pp. 151–62. His brothers became archdeacons. Another probable member of the family was the famous Alan of Walsingham, sacrist of Ely, who was responsible for the building of the octagon in the cathedral church in Edward III's reign. The bishop may have been born outside Ely at Meldreth, where his father held property; his name in religion seems to have been John de Melre or John de Ely; *cf.* J. Bentham, *History and Antiquities of the Cathedral Church of Ely*, ed. W. Stevenson (Norwich, 1812–17), i. 218.

[3] *Parl. Writs*, II, ii. 619; II, iii. 520.

[4] *Registrum Palatinum Dunelmense* (Rolls Ser.), iii, pp. cxii–cxiv; *D.N.B.*, *s.v.* Kellawe; S. Lewis, *Topographical Dictionary of England* (7th edn., London, 1848), *s.v.* Kelloe. The bishop's brother, Peter de Kellawe, a graduate, was possibly author of the *Gesta Dunelmensia*, a lively account of Durham priory's quarrel with Bishop Anthony Bek, *Camden Miscellany*, xiii (Royal Hist. Soc., 1924), pp. vi; *cf.* 43–4).

Hamon de Hethe, monk, prior and later bishop of Rochester, was born in the parish of St. Leonard in the port of Hythe, Kent, where he founded a hospital for poor persons of the town on the site of his parents' house. Their family name was apparently Noble.[1] Both these bishops found appointments and benefices in their dioceses and cathedral priories for many kinsmen.[2] Little is known of the family of Robert of Orford, the prior of Ely who was bishop of Ely from 1302 to 1310, but it can perhaps be assumed that as a monk he would take his name from the place where he was born. This was probably the town and port of Orford in Suffolk, where the cathedral priory of Ely had port rights.[3]

The seculars in this group were less commonly local men. Simon of Ghent, bishop of Salisbury, is said to have been born in London, and is thought to have come from a London family of merchants with connexions in the Low Countries.[4] He was probably elected as bishop by Salisbury cathedral chapter chiefly because of his academic distinction and ecclesiastical experience. Walter Reynolds, bishop of Worcester and archbishop of Canterbury, rose through the royal service.[5] Nothing has been found to disprove the tradition that he was the son of a baker in Windsor named Reginald, while a few pieces of evidence suggest that it may be correct.[6] John Ross, a household clerk of bishops and cardinals and an auditor of the sacred palace, who was provided by the pope to the northern see of Carlisle, came from the market

[1] *Registrum Hamonis Hethe, Diocesis Roffensis, 1319–52* (Canterbury and York Soc.), i, pp. ix–x, 393–4, 428.

[2] *Ibid.*, pp. ix–x, 424–8; *Registrum Palatinum Dunelmense*, iii, pp. xii–xiv; Robert de Graystanes in *Hist. Dunelmensis Scriptores Tres* (Surtees Soc.), p. 97.

[3] S. J. A. Evans, 'Ely Chapter Ordinances and Visitation Injunctions', *Camden Miscellany*, xvii (Camden 3rd Ser., lxiv, Royal Hist. Soc., 1940), p. 2n.

[4] *Flores Historiarum* (Rolls Ser.), iii. 103; *Reg. S. de Gandavo, Bishop of Salisbury*, pp. v–vii.

[5] *Vita Edwardi Secundi*, p. 45; *Ann. Paul.* in *Chronicles Edward I and II*, i. 257; *Foedera*, II, i. 101; T. F. Tout in *D.N.B.*, *s.v.* Reynolds.

[6] *Cf.* H. Wharton, *Anglia Sacra* (London, 1691), i. 532. Birchington (*ibid.*, p. 18) said that he was of Windsor; and a Ralph of Windsor was one of his executors, *Sede Vacante Wills*, ed. C. E. Woodruff (Kent Records, iii, Kent Arch. Soc., 1914), p. 71. He is called Heyne in *Ann. Lond.*, *Chronicles Edward I and II*, i. 229. A Richard Heyne, *pestour*, of London, presented a petition in parliament in 1322, *Rotuli Parliamentorum* (Record Commission), i. 392.

town of Ross in Herefordshire, where his parents' names were Roger le Mercer and Sibyl.[1] Very little is known of the family of Archbishop Winchelsea, the most distinguished scholar, statesman and bishop of the reign, but it seems clear from his will that he was born at Old Winchelsea in Sussex,[2] which had been a member of the Cinque Ports since Henry II's reign, and was a place of commercial importance.[3] The origin of Adam de Orleton, bishop of Hereford, is obscure. He seems to have been a local man who made his way in the royal service with much energy and ability after graduating in law. He was probably born in the city of Hereford, not on the Mortimer's manor of Orleton in Herefordshire, as has sometimes been suggested.[4] A family of Orleton was settled in Hereford by the mid-thirteenth century, and by the early fourteenth century the name occurs fairly frequently and prominently in the city records.[5] Two references which date from before Adam's close connexion with the see of Hereford describe him as Adam of Hereford;[6] and Adam and his

[1] *Registrum Ricardi de Swinfield, Episcopi Herefordensis, 1283–1317* (Canterbury and York Soc.), pp. 477–82, 507. He founded a chantry there for their souls in 1313. He had previously been vicar of Ross (*Cal. Papal Letters*, ii. 72), and was also a canon and subdean of Hereford cathedral, and archdeacon of Shropshire. The suggestion in *D.N.B.*, *s.v.* Ross, that he was a son of Robert, first baron Ros of Helmsley in Yorkshire, is without foundation. The author of the Lanercost Chronicle wrote of him as a southerner, and said that after his death his body was taken for burial to the south whence he came, *Chronicon de Lanercost* (Maitland Club), pp. 253, 276.

[2] *Registrum Roberti Winchelsey, Cantuariensis Archiepiscopi* (Canterbury and York Soc.), pp. xxxii, 1342.

[3] *Cf.* K. M. E. Murray, *Constitutional History of the Cinque Ports* (Manchester, 1935), pp. 1, 12–15, 235 and *passim*; T. F. Tout, 'Medieval Town Planning' in *Collected Papers* (Manchester 1934), iii. 81–4.

[4] Canon Bannister, the editor of Adam's Hereford register, favoured the idea that he was born on the manor of Orleton, and argued that the bishop's political adherence to Roger Mortimer of Wigmore was in part territorial loyalty to the lord on whose manor he was born. Leland, however, had said that he was born in Hereford (*natus in Hereforde*), *Register of Adam de Orleton, Bishop of Hereford, 1317–27*, p. ii; J. Leland, *Itinerary*, ed. L. T. Smith (London, 1907–10), v. 161.

[5] *Hist. MSS. Comm., 13th Rept.*, app. iv, pp. 296–7; *Parl. Writs*, I, i. 766; II. iii. 1246; *Reg. Orleton*, p. ii.

[6] *Register of Henry Woodlock, Bishop of Winchester*, i. 592; *Foedera*, II, i. 137. *Cf.* Bodl. Lib., Tanner MS. 197, fo. 42 (*A.D.* 1311): 'Magistro Ade de Orleton' dicto de Hereford', clerico. . . .'

brother John owned certain tenements in the city which they did not dispose of until 1338.[1] Their background was perhaps comfortable and middle class.

Of the remaining seventeen bishops, some are known to have come from humble families; others are of unknown origin. If more could be discovered about these, it might be found that a few were connected with families of knights or landed gentry, but probably most of the Englishmen among them were new men.

William of Melton, the keeper of Edward II's wardrobe as prince and king who rose to be treasurer of England and archbishop of York, is an outstanding example of a man of humble birth who reached the highest position in the land through the church and the royal service. His family could have given him little help for his father was a franklin of Melton near Howden in Yorkshire.[2] William seems to have combined powers of leadership with integrity and remarkable financial ability, which enabled him as archbishop to make an impressive series of loans to kings and bishops and to many Yorkshire knights and monasteries; to put together a private estate, and to establish his nephew and niece in the knightly society of Yorkshire.[3] His own Yorkshire origin helped him to understand the problems of the north. He seems to have been recognized by the northern barons, knights and churchmen as their natural political leader in defending the north against the Scots.[4]

Other royal clerks of obscure origin who gained bishoprics were not usually appointed to rule the dioceses in which they had been born. William Airmyn, bishop of Norwich, the former chancery clerk, and his brothers Richard and Adam are often claimed as Yorkshiremen, who helped to swell the remarkably large

[1] Register of Adam de Orleton, Bishop of Winchester, 1333–45 (at Winchester), fo. 68v. I owe this reference to the kindness of Dr. G. A. Usher. Adam's nephews, John and Thomas Trillek, came from the village of Trilleck, co. Monmouth, where members of their family held land and were sufficiently important to bear arms, *Registrum Johannis de Trillek, Episcopi Herefordensis, 1344–61* (Canterbury and York Soc.), pp. i–ii.

[2] L. H. Butler, 'Archbishop Melton, his Neighbours and his Kinsmen', *Jour. Eccl. Hist.*, ii (1951), 63.

[3] *Ibid.*, pp. 54–68.

[4] *Cf. Eng. Hist. Rev.*, lix (1944), 337–8; B. Wilkinson, 'The Sherburn Indenture and the Attack on the Despensers, 1321', *ibid.*, lxiii (1948), 4 ff.

number of Yorkshire clerks in the royal administration in the late thirteenth and in the fourteenth century.[1] They certainly had Yorkshire connexions. In 1319 they were vitally concerned in the defence of Yorkshire against the Scots, and Adam and Richard were captured at the battle of Myton.[2] In 1328 they purchased a considerable holding at Crathorne, right up near the Durham border.[3] But it is by no means certain that they came from Airmyn near Osgodby in Yorkshire, which was the birthplace of Adam of Osgodby, their colleague in the royal chancery, attractive though this theory may be.[4] Fuller said that they came from a family living at Osgodby in Lincolnshire,[5] and it is disconcerting to find that land was held there by a William Dirmyn in 1346 and by a William de Ayrmyn, knight, in 1412.[6] The origin of Roger Northburgh, the wardrobe clerk and keeper of the privy seal who became bishop of Coventry and Lichfield, is equally obscure. Again there seems to be no real evidence for the suggestion that he was born at Norbury in Staffordshire within his future diocese.[7] He founded a powerful official family and provided liberally for his kinsmen in his diocese after his own rise to power,[8] but nothing is known of them previously. The most obscure of the royal

[1] *Cf.* below, p. 76, n. 2.

[2] *Ann. Paul.* in *Chronicles of Reigns of Edward I and II*, i. 287.

[3] *Feet of Fines for the County of York, 1327–47* (Yorkshire Archaeological Soc., Record Ser. xlii, 1910), p. 6.

[4] W. H. Stevenson, in his unpublished introduction to the Calendars of Close Rolls of Edward II's reign, quoted in *Scottish Hist. Rev.*, xxv (1928), 381–2, and A. H. Thompson, *Register of Thomas Corbridge, Archbishop of York, 1300–04*, (Surtees Soc.), i. 11n., suggest that Adam of Osgodby, Robert of Barlby and William of Airmyn, the three chancery clerks in charge of the great seal in 1311 and 1312, were all Yorkshiremen from the south-east of the county.

[5] T. Fuller, *Worthies of England* (1840 edn.), ii. 272–3.

[6] *Feudal Aids*, iii. 202; vi. 479. A family of Sewals of Airmyn held property at Airmyn in Yorkshire in 1328 (*Cal. Pat. Rolls, 1327–30*, p. 247; *cf. ibid., 1317–21*, p. 337; *Cal. Close Rolls, 1307–13*, p. 258), but no evidence has been found to connect members of this family with William or his brothers. The names of William's parents are given in *Anglia Sacra*, i. 802, as Adam and Matilda.

[7] *D.N.B.*, *s.v.* Northburgh.

[8] *Cf. ibid.;* Tout, *Chapters*, iv. 119–20; Le Neve, *Fasti Eccl. Anglicane*, i. 589, 591, 593, 595–6, 602, 608, 624, 640. The author of the *Flores Historiarum* (Rolls Ser.), iii. 200, says that Roger succeeded to his bishopric *per viam impressionis et ambitionis*, suggesting that he was a new man.

clerks is Walter Maidstone, bishop of Worcester. Nothing is known of his family.[1]

Five more bishops of English sees had spent their early careers in the service of the church. Two were secular and three were regular clergy. Rigaud d'Assier, bishop of Winchester from 1320 to 1323, was the second of the only two foreigners in the episcopate. He is thought to have been born at Assier, a village in the duchy of Aquitaine, a few miles north of Cahors,[2] the birthplace of John XXII, to whom he seems to have owed his rapid promotion. But like Louis de Beaumont he had had experience of life in England before his appointment; since May 1317 he had been in England as papal nuncio, collecting papal taxes.[3] Nothing has been discovered of the social rank of his family. Gerald d'Assier, a doctor of canon law, who acted as his vicar-general, was his brother and executor, and the names of other probable kinsmen and Frenchmen appear in his register.[4] Richard de Swinfield, bishop of Hereford, probably derived his name from the village of Swingfield near Folkestone in Kent.[5] As bishop he held a small estate at Womenswould in Kent, and a large number of Kentish names appear among members of his household. His father Stephen died at the episcopal manor of Bosbury. His brother Stephen, a layman, seems with his sons to have been a permanent member of the bishop's household. Other kinsmen and men from Kent were given prebends and offices in Hereford diocese.[6] The bishop had entered the service of Thomas de Cantelupe some years before Thomas became bishop of Hereford; was collated by

[1] Although a king's clerk and provided to a bishopric while on a royal mission to the pope (*cf. Cal. Pat. Rolls, 1301–7*, p. 67; *1307–13*, p. 454; *Cal. Close Rolls, 1307–13*, p. 456; *Foedera* (1818), II, i. 161, 175–6, 194, 196–7, 226–7, 240), he is not mentioned in Tout's *Chapters*, nor in the *D.N.B.* His register as bishop has not been printed. A number of men called Maidstone who appear in records of the period were connected with Kent, but no evidence has been found to show that they were kinsmen of the bishop.

[2] *Register of Rigaud de Asserio, Bishop of Winchester, 1320–23* (Hampshire Record Soc. 1897), p. ix.

[3] *Cf. ibid.*, pp. 555–60.

[4] *Ibid.*, pp. 388, 463, 473, 496, 588–95 and *passim.*

[5] E. Hasted, *History and Topographical Survey of the County of Kent* (Canterbury, 1778–99), viii. 124, says that he was born there.

[6] Tout in *D.N.B.*, *s.v.* Swinfield; *Roll of the Household Expenses of Richard de Swinfield, Bishop of Hereford, 1289–90*, ed. J. Webb (Camden Soc., 1855), p. cvi; *Reg. Swinfield*, index.

him to successive prebends in Hereford cathedral, and remained as a member of his *familia* until his death in 1282,[1] when he was elected as Thomas's successor by the cathedral chapter. The three regular clergy had all been members of the cathedral priories which elected them to their bishoprics. John Halton, an Augustinian canon of the cathedral priory of Carlisle, probably had a local and north country origin, but the place name Halton is too common to suggest that he came from any particular place, and no evidence has been found to connect him with any of the local or knightly families of this name.[2] Thomas of Wouldham, the Benedictine prior and later bishop of Rochester, almost certainly came from the parish of Wouldham in Kent, only $3\frac{1}{4}$ miles from Rochester, which belonged to Rochester cathedral priory; the name Wouldham is fairly common among the monks of the cathedral priory.[3] John de Ketene or Ketton, almoner and later bishop of Ely, has a more uncommon name which suggests the village of Ketton near Stamford in the county of Rutland. The Ely chronicler, when describing his election, contrasted him with Master Boniface de Saluzzo, *quidam clericus generosus*, whose appointment the king, queen and magnates were promoting;[4] John is merely said to be *de legitimo matrimonio procreatus*.[5]

There remain six bishops of Welsh sees, of whom only one can possibly have been an outsider. This was John Egglescliffe, a Dominican friar, who may have derived his name from Egglescliffe near Yarm in county Durham.[6] It has however been pointed out by W. de G. Birch that Eclesclif was also an alternative name for Goldclive, county Monmouth.[7] Perhaps the north country

[1] *Reg. Swinfield*, pp. 234–5; *Acta Sanctorum*, Octobris, I (Paris and Rome, 1866), p. 541.

[2] *Register of John de Halton, Bishop of Carlisle, 1292–1324* (Canterbury and York Soc.), i. i; C. M. L. Bouch, *Prelates and People of the Lake Counties. A History of the Diocese of Carlisle, 1133–1933* (Kendal, 1948), p. 63.

[3] *E.g. Registrum Roffense*, ed. J. Thorpe (London, 1769), pp. 75, 118, 122, 317. Monks at this time normally took their surnames from the places where they were born, and so these names, unlike those of the seculars, are important evidence for the bishops' provenance.

[4] *Hist. Eliensis* in *Anglia Sacra*, i. 641–2.

[5] Quoted by J. Bentham, *History and Antiquities of the Cathedral Church of Ely*, ed. W. Stevenson (Norwich, 1812–17), iii. 84.

[6] C. F. R. Palmer, 'Prelates of the Black Friars', *The Antiquary*, xxvi (1892), 209.

[7] *Memorials of the See of Llandaff* (Neath, 1912), p. 325.

origin is the more likely, for a few pieces of evidence suggest that John had northern connexions.[1] But in either case he brought a very varied outside experience to his Welsh diocese of Llandaff. He had been a papal penitentiary at the Roman curia and was provided by the pope in turn to the bishoprics of Glasgow, Connor and Llandaff.[2] John Monmouth, his predecessor at Llandaff, although born in England, was said to have lived long in Wales, to speak Welsh and to be known and loved by the inhabitants of his diocese as if from birth.[3] He is sometimes called John of Ludlow,[4] but no evidence has been found to connect him either with the contemporary knightly or merchant families of Ludlow, or with descendants of the family of Monmouth, Welsh marcher lords of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. He was a theologian and former chancellor of Oxford University, who seems to have owed his bishopric to his Oxford connexions and friendship with Archbishop Winchelsea.[5] There can be no doubt from the names of Gruffydd ap Iorwerth and Eineon Sais, bishops of Bangor, or of Llewellyn Bromfield and David ap Bleddyn, bishops of St. Asaph, that all were Welshmen. The name Sais meaning 'Saxon' suggests no more than possible English connexions or sympathies of the bishop or his ancestors.[6] Most of these Welshmen were canons or dignitaries of the cathedral chapters which elected them, but the absence of Welsh records and particularly of Welsh bishops' registers for this period has made it almost impossible to discover anything about their family

[1] In 1314, when a papal penitentiary, he wrote to Bishop Halton of Carlisle, absolving a layman of the diocese of Carlisle from sacrilege (*Reg. Halton*, ii. 95). Between 1318 and 1323, when he was unable to get possession of his dioceses of Glasgow and Down and Connor because of the war, he seems to have been employed mainly on commissions from Archbishop Melton in York diocese (*Historical Papers and Letters from the Northern Dioceses* (Rolls Ser.), pp. 299–300 and n.). Nothing has been found to prove that he was connected with the knightly family of Eaglescliff which held land in the counties of Durham and York, but it is interesting to notice that a John de Eggisclyve witnessed two undated charters of the friars preacher of Yarm which received royal confirmation in 1314 (*Cal. Pat. Rolls, 1313–17*, p. 172).

[2] Palmer, *loc. cit.*

[3] *Reg. Winchelsey*, p. 514.

[4] *Annales de Oseneia* in *Annales Monastici*, iv. 324.

[5] *Reg. Winchelsey*, pp. 5–8, 513–14, 1342; *Sede Vacante Wills* (Kent Records, iii), p. 65; *Church Quarterly Rev.*, cxxxviii. 59, 61, 67–8, 71–2, 74.

[6] *Cf.* J. E. Morris, *Welsh Wars of Edward I* (Oxford, 1901), p. 86.

connexions or social background. Llewellyn of Bromfield may have derived his name from Bromfield in the diocese of St. Asaph, which before 1282 was held by a Gruffydd of Bromfield and his sons.[1]

Bishops in Edward II's reign, then, were drawn from all ranks of society, and, perhaps in contrast to the bishops of most countries of Europe, those from the middle and humbler ranks were more numerous and in a number of cases more distinguished than the *ingenui*. There would seem to have been little change during the reign in the relative proportions of gentle and low-born men promoted to the episcopate; certainly there was no marked increase of aristocrats in the later years of the reign. Most interesting, perhaps, is the large group of important bishops who came from the towns and cities. But distinguished and undistinguished men are to be found in all the social groups.

How was it that in England, unlike Germany, so many new men were able to rise to high positions in the church? Their three main avenues seem to have been the royal administration, the universities, and the cathedral monasteries. Tout has written of the fourteenth-century royal clerks that the official type was 'obscure in origin and family . . . owing everything to their master's good will'.[2] This description is truer of the royal clerks promoted to bishoprics in this reign than it would have been in Henry III's reign, when Miss Gibbs, in her analysis of the composition of the episcopate, included administrators and magnates in one group united by their connexions with the royal court.[3] A few of Edward II's bishops who owed their sees primarily to their services to the crown came from families of the well-born; for example, Antony Bek among the older generation or John Hotham among the younger. But there are far more cases of the promotion of royal clerks from humble or obscure families. A successful university career might also open the way to promotion in the church to men with little or no family influence. They might form connexions in the schools with men who later rose to high positions. It frequently happened that scholar bishops would collate old fellow students or former pupils to benefices or prebends in their dioceses, and so provide means and influence for

[1] W. H. Waters, *Edwardian Settlement of North Wales*, p. 91.
[2] *Chapters*, ii. 14.
[3] M. Gibbs and J. Lang, *Bishops and Reform, 1215–72*, p. 11.

their appointment as bishops. Robert of Winchelsea, Simon of Ghent, and John of Monmouth were probably all men from humble families who owed their bishoprics chiefly to their academic distinction. But the situation was again different from that in Henry III's reign, when Miss Gibbs was able to draw a distinction between the *magistri* or university graduates among the bishops on the one hand, and the administrators and magnates on the other.[1] In Edward II's reign all the magnate bishops (most of them belonging to families of the lesser magnates) had attended universities, and one, Thomas of Cobham, was a distinguished scholar, who probably owed his bishopric more to his academic attainments than to his family's influence. The royal clerks also were frequently graduates, often with degrees in civil and canon law. The universities had therefore become an avenue to careers in church and state used by men of all social ranks, with the possible exception of the sons of the great earls. It is interesting to notice that Robert Holcot, the Dominican theologian, humanist and preacher, writing in the first half of the fourteenth century, could still remark that 'great men did not wish their sons to be lettered', and that 'sons of the rich and powerful will not learn, while the sons of simple, poor men reach the highest ecclesiastical dignities by their character and science'.[2] Perhaps this is one reason why so few sons of the greater magnates obtained bishoprics in Edward II's reign. By the later fourteenth and in the fifteenth century they had evidently overcome their prejudice against learning. Members of the high aristocracy, who were appointed to bishoprics in increasing numbers in the period after 1350, had normally had a distinguished university career.

The seven Benedictine monks and one Augustian canon successfully elected as bishops by the cathedral priories nearly all came from the towns or from the humbler or middle-class rural families. Professor Knowles has written that although in the twelfth century members of feudal families and even of royal blood were to be found in the English monasteries, this was very rare later. While a number of monasteries on the continent became preserves for the sons of nobles or knightly families, the majority of English monks in the later middle ages were the sons of bur-

[1] *Ibid.*, pp. 3–4 *et passim.*

[2] Quoted by Beryl Smalley, 'Robert Holcot, O.P.', *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum*, xxvi (1956), 94.

gesses or of the middle and lower ranks of rural landholders and freemen.[1] The cathedral priories, therefore, were among the institutions which in England offered a career open to talent in the medieval church. The secular cathedral chapters, on the other hand, more often chose the sons of knights or local landed gentry as their bishops, when they were able to hold a more or less free election. There were, however, no social restrictions or requirements for certain degrees of nobility for entry to the English chapters, such as existed in some continental chapters.[2] The English secular chapters, like the episcopate (which was largely chosen from them) had a 'mixed' social character. Richard de Swinfield and Simon of Ghent are examples of secular canons of apparently humble origin elected as bishops by their chapters.

In England under Edward II local influence was much more powerful than aristocratic influence on the appointments of bishops. It is especially interesting to see how local feeling, which in Germany worked inseparably from aristocratic influence, was in England expressed far more strongly in the appointments of men of the lower social ranks. Of the six magnate bishops only one (David Martin at St. Davids) came from the part of the country in which his diocese lay. But in the episcopate as a whole the proportion was far higher. Of the forty-five bishops of the reign about twenty-three are thought to have been born in or near the diocese they were to rule, and four more had had previous connexions with their dioceses either through kinsmen or as members of the cathedral chapters. Of the others, as has already been said, only two were foreigners, and both of these had lived in England for some years before their appointments.

This fewness of foreigners shows how little foundation there was for the chroniclers' outcry against them. Under Henry III about seven bishops in an episcopate of seventy-nine had been aliens; in Edward III's reign there were none.[3] Thus the English episcopate was becoming steadily more English.

The strength of localism and nationalism is illustrated most

[1] D. Knowles, *Religious Orders in England*, ii (Cambridge, 1955), pp. 229–30.

[2] *Cf.* K. Edwards, *The English Secular Cathedrals in the Middle Ages* (Manchester, 1949), p. 34.

[3] M. Gibbs and J. Lang, *op. cit.*; W. A. Pantin, *op. cit.*, pp. 56–7; J. R. L. Highfield, *op. cit.*, p. 132.

forcibly among the bishops of the four Welsh sees. Here the rule of canon law that a bishop must be able to speak the language of the inhabitants of his diocese seems to have been carefully observed. In an episcopate of seven, four were Welshmen; one was the son of a Welsh marcher lord; another, although born in England, was Welsh speaking and had long lived in Wales, and only one, a Dominican friar, may have been an outsider. This is remarkable, for the period was that following the complete political conquest of Wales by Edward I, which had brought with it much greater dependence of the Welsh church on the archbishop of Canterbury. In time this was to lead to big changes in the character of the Welsh episcopate.[1] By the fifteenth century the Welsh sees were being looked upon as the first step on the ladder for promising English civil servants who expected later to be translated to richer English sees. The early fourteenth century, however, shows little change in the national or social character of the Welsh episcopate as compared with that of the thirteenth century.

The large proportion of local men ruling English sees suggests that there would be no special predominance in the episcopate of men from any one part of England, and this is broadly true. All the different regions had representatives in the episcopate. Nearly one-third of the royal clerks (*i.e.* five out of sixteen) came from south Yorkshire, Nottinghamshire and Lindsey. This is a reflection of the important part which clerks from this region were playing in the royal administration at the time.[2] The largest group of eleven bishops came from Kent, London and the adjoining counties, which was natural, because this was the most prosperous part of England. But there were also interesting groups from the far north, the midlands and the south-west. There is much of interest to be discovered by attempting to analyse the influence of

[1] *Cf.* J. C. Davies, ed. *Episcopal Acts and Cognate Documents relating to Welsh Dioceses, 1066–1272* (Hist. Soc. of Church in Wales, 1948), ii. 594–605.

[2] For the importance of Yorkshiremen in the royal administration in the period from about 1280 until the early fifteenth century, see especially W. H. Stevenson's unpublished introduction to the Calendar of Close Rolls of Edward II's reign, quoted in *Scottish Hist. Rev.*, xxv (1928), 111, 381–2; Tout's *Chapters*, and A. H. Thompson, *The Medieval Chapter* (York Minster Tracts), pp. 12–15; *Vict. Co. Hist., Yorkshire*, iii. 378; *Register of Archbishop Greenfield*, i, p. xviii.

the differing political outlooks of the barons in the various regions of England, such as the north, the midlands, or the Welsh march, on the political activities of the bishops ruling sees in their midst. When a bishop had been born in the diocese he was later to rule, it often happened that he was more ready to adopt and sometimes to lead political opinion in his part of the country. These regional influences on the bishops are among the factors which help to account for the absence of any united political action by the episcopate, especially in the later years of the reign after the death of Archbishop Winchelsea.[1] They seem to have influenced bishops drawn from humble families almost as much as the magnate bishops, and were at least as important in determining their political activities as their early careers in the royal administration or at the universities.

How was it that so many local men were appointed to English sees during his reign? Generally it seems that the cathedral chapters (the regular chapters more often than the seculars) elected local men as their bishops whenever possible, and that most bishops without previous connexions in their dioceses owed their appointments to king or pope. It is significant that among the older generation of bishops appointed before 1316 (*i.e.* during the period when appointments were still made more frequently by election than by papal provision) local men outnumbered the outsiders by about seventeen to eleven. But after the accession of John XXII in 1316 when provisions, made both in accordance with and against the king's wishes, became far more usual, there were ten appointments of outsiders and only seven of local men. In this period, however, pope and king were ready enough, when it was convenient to themselves, to recognize the use or strength of local influence by promoting local men, as when Edward II urged the appointment of William Melton to York, or when John XXII provided Adam of Orleton to Hereford. Moreover, the practice of translation had not yet become common. During the twenty years from 1307 to 1327 only one bishop was translated to a second see.[2] The result was that, although the proportion of local men in the episcopate was slowly becoming less with the growing prevalence of papal provisions, the bishops, once appointed, still

[1] *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, lix. 312, 326, 333–8, 346–7.

[2] *I.e.* Walter Reynolds, bishop of Worcester, who was translated to Canterbury in 1313.

normally expected to remain in their sees for the rest of their lives; and a number devoted themselves to diocesan work with a zeal comparable with that of their thirteenth-century predecessors. A useful balance was found between local men and outsiders in the episcopate, and it is clear that both, when they wished, could contribute much of value to their dioceses. The work of Archbishop Melton at York or of John Dalderby at Lincoln are examples of the important achievements of local men with local knowledge and interests; that of Roger Martival at Salisbury or of Thomas de Cobham at Worcester shows the value to their dioceses of able bishops from outside, who brought with them the benefits of a wider ecclesiastical experience.

APPENDIX

Letter from Katherine Paynel to John de Langton

(Ancient Correspondence, XXVII, no. 113)

A seon treschir e especial amy en Deu, si li plest, Sire Johan de Langheton', chancelir nostre seygnur le Reys, sowe lyge e jadis mere, si li plest, Katerine Paynel, saluz o sa beneyzon e preste tuz jors a voz comandemenz. Chir sire e fis, mut ay grant joye au quer de vostre avancement e loe seit Deus de la grace kil wus ad done ke tute gent wus eyment, e cele perseverence wus pust a tute vostre vie durer, e ceo est ma priere e ad este e serra tant cum jeo wyf. A ceo, chir sire, il wus sovint, sil wus plest, remenbrer pus nostre premire aquentance cum jeo ay mey meymes e mes enfanz o poy de eyde gwye e sustenu a grif charge. Mes beneit seit nostre Seygnur, il me sont asset treitables e humbles e aukune garison hont les fiz tuz, e ma fille purra deus consailler kant li plerra. Chir sire, mon pusne fiz, Esthiffne Paynel, me prie e requert sovent ke jeo le mette a la curt en servise ou en compaynnie ou il pust aprendre sens e manire, dont il pust aver recoverir apres mei si mestir ust. E certes, sire, jeo ni ay ore certene aquentance for, si wus plest, la vostre. Dont jeo wus pri e requer, chir sire, pur lamur de mei e pur tutes amistez ke par vostre consail e eyde le pusse ileokes mettre o wus meymes, sire, ou par vostre bayl. E jeo, sire, li troveray tute manire de custages

a mon poher ci la kil se pusse garir. Chir sire, de cete priere me weoillet par vostre lettre mander par memes le portur. E en tuz autres choses vostre pleisir e soverenement de vostre estat de cors et de sante ke Deu doint ke bone seit e longhe. A Deu, sire, wus comand e a sa duce mere.

THE OTHER FACE OF MERCANTILISM

By Charles Wilson, M.A.

READ ON 10 MAY 1958

'IN England', Sir John Seeley once wrote, 'it is our custom to alter things but to leave their names unaltered.' [1] Anyone who wished to test the truth of the dictum historiographically might examine the history of the word 'mercantilism'. It has borne many, sometimes oddly conflicting, meanings, but they have had at any rate one thing in common: they have all been in some degree unpalatable to those reared in the traditions of English liberal thought. It was as the conspiracy of a mercantile minority out to line its pockets at the expense of the rest of the community that the system was first depicted by the classical economists.[2] The interpretation of the German school of historical economists a century later was certainly no less distasteful to the liberal mind. To Bismarckian Germans it might appear seemly to condone the pursuit of aggression and covet its rewards. But even Chamberlainites—like W. A. S. Hewins—amongst English historians had their doubts, and to George Unwin state 'policy' was simply a sham—the supreme illustration of the evils of bigness. The economic actions of the political body were not even the early thrustings of a lusty infant, but the morbid twitchings of disease. And Unwin, who believed that historians should be concerned with the life of communities, not with the actions of states, found more sympathizers in his profession (one suspects) than Cunningham, who was nearer to the German tradition. Others, misliking what they took to be the moral and intellectual confusion of mercantilists and their works, agreed to deny any title of coherence to folly so diverse and deplorable.[3] Thus the history of national policy was persuasively represented as a series of contests from which greed and stupidity emerged monotonously victorious.

[1] Sir J. Seeley, *Science of Politics* (1896), p. 298.

[2] A. Smith, *The Wealth of Nations*, book iv.

[3] See A. V. Judges, 'The idea of a mercantile state', *Trans. Roy. Hist. Soc.*, 4th series, xxi (1939).

No period or society came out of the inquiry with fewer honours than that of Restoration England and the century that followed: the years when (according to Adam Smith) the principles of the mercantile system were devised and applied in legislative form. When the inquiring beam lighted and focused on the ruling classes, it found them treating the wage-earners—I am quoting from Professor Tawney's *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism*—in the same way as coloured labour was treated by the less reputable colonists, consigned to 'collective perdition'. This, Professor Tawney explained, was 'partly the result of the greatly increased influence on thought and public affairs acquired at the Restoration by the commercial classes, whose temper was a ruthless materialism, determined at all costs to conquer world markets from France and Holland and prepared to sacrifice every other consideration to their economic ambitions'.[1] Professor Tawney's verdict was echoed by Mr. Beloff when he came to write his study of *Public Order and Popular Disturbance 1660–1714* in 1938. Again, ruthless mercantile ambition is linked in guilt with the destruction of the central machinery of welfare: the Privy Council. The Civil War brought social *laissez-faire*, and the Restoration failed to restore an independent social policy. 'Rarely indeed', writes Mr. Beloff, 'can national weath, as opposed to welfare, have predominated to such an extent as it did in the minds of the ruling class of the period.'[2]

The picture that has been created is that of a ruthlessly materialistic ruling class which did not merely neglect but actively exploited the poor. 'Mercantilists', an authority on economic thought writes, 'if they held any wage theory at all, believed in an economy of low wages.'[3] For Miss Margaret James the social legislators of the Restoration 'aimed at nothing less than making the poor a source of profit to the state by forcing them to work for reduced wages'.[4] The presence of a few nobly philanthropic exceptions to this general rule was not enough to soften the indictment. Firmin, the London mercer of Socinian leanings, who experimented in social reform or the Quaker, Bellers, whose

[1] R. H. Tawney, *op. cit.* (London, 1926), p. 268.
[2] M. Beloff, *op. cit.*, p. 18.
[3] E. Roll, *A History of Economic Thought* (London, 1939), p. 99.
[4] M. James, *Social Policy during the Puritan Revolution* (London, 1930), pp. 344–5.

Proposals for a College of Industry (1695) showed deep concern for social welfare, emerge as entirely exceptional figures, quite untypical of their age. How far is all this a just and representative account of the aims and attitudes of the governing classes of Britain in the years that followed the Restoration?

There is no reason to question the belief that the wealth and power of the state represented the twin objectives of much of the thought and policy of the time, inseparably joined in the contemporary mind. It was deemed by most writers the function of government to intervene in the operation of the economy to secure economic ends that could, they thought, be secured in no other way, and the great majority of those who have made a study of mercantilism would, I think, agree with Adam Smith that the apparatus of legislative intervention consisted of those 'two great engines', the manipulation of exports and imports according to certain principles which would nourish native manufactures. The motive principle of both 'engines' was the same: the balance of trade. The efficacy of the entire system was to be measured by the condition of the 'balance'. Recent over-elaboration of the concept of mercantilism has reawakened old scepticism, raising afresh the question whether it is not merely an arabesque woven by the imagination of historians upon the facts of history. It seems to me as dangerous to deny that certain principles informed both thought and policy in this period as it is to apostrophize those principles and exaggerate their effects. It is equally fallacious to suppose that thought and policy were distinct activities that can and should be treated separately. No body of economic literature was ever more closely related to interest and policy than the writings of the mercantilists. Much (though not all) of it represents the skirmishings of interested parties round the political lobbies; and of all the writers mentioned in this paper I can think of only two of whom it could be said that they did not in their own persons exercise some practical influence on economic policy or institutions. The mercantilist writers were neither scribblers nor idealists. They were not sophisticated or labyrinthine. Even their *Utopias* were earthy ones and it was not accidental that they frequently spelt the word as *Eutopia*, meaning a place where all was well.[1] They felt no call to disguise the material character of their

[1] Harold Child, 'Some English Utopias', *Transactions of the Royal Society of Literature*, iii (1933).

aims. They have little relevance to any times but those in which they lived. Unlike the Diggers, the Levellers and the other social revolutionaries, they have not attracted the devotional attentions of those historians whose preoccupations are really political rather than historical. If they sin, it is not in being heartless or materialist, but in being a bit dull.

In the early formulations of policy, the virtue of a favourable balance was held, quite uncomplicatedly, to reside in the net influx of bullion which was assumed to be its necessary consequence. This doctrine was still powerful in the period of which we are speaking. Indeed, Mun's classical statement of it, though written perhaps forty years earlier, was published for the first time in 1664. It was in the following year—the year of the Plague—that there was sketched out the first draft of an economic tract which, in its various revisions, was to exercise a powerful influence on thought and policy, not only in England but in many European States also, especially in Italy, France, Germany and Austria. This was Josiah Child's *New Discourse of Trade* as it became known in later editions. When it first appeared in print, in 1668, it was as a very short affair under the appropriate title of *Brief Observations*, and it dealt principally with problems of interest rates and usury. Attached to it by way of appendix was a note by Culpeper on the problem of usury which contained a section on the relief of the poor. Its general theme will be evident from this text: 'He that is weary of his life fears neither axe nor gibbet: and to prosecute such by the methods of Justice I will not say it is like the Excommunication of Rats but I am sure it resembles the Outlawing of Tories.' Child's work, which is not mentioned by Professor Tawney, went into five editions between 1668 and his death in 1699. As edition succeeded edition, two themes grew in importance: the relief and employment of the poor, and the relationship of employment to the national welfare as reflected in the balance of trade. From Culpeper's text, Child develops the theme that it is man's 'Duty to God and Nature to provide for and employ the poor, whose condition is sad and wretched, diseased, impotent, useless.' In the later editions, this crystallizes into his famous proposal for an assembly of 'Fathers of the Poor', endowed with powers to buy land, build workhouses and hospitals and to set the poor on work, with a special *non obstante* to overcome obstructive patents. Simultaneously, Child modified the

existing conception of the balance of trade. Sharing the doubts of that considerable body of persons who despaired of ever measuring accurately the volume of imports and exports, Child came to the conclusion that the balance might be judged better by measuring the general volume of trade with reference to the 'number of hands' employed. The juxtaposition of ideas might well begin to look suspicious: on the one hand, proposals for organized charity; on the other, a theory that comes near to equating national prosperity with the effective value of its labour. Add that Child was a City merchant with a reputation for tough and none-too-scrupulous bargaining, who hated competition, Dutch or English, and did not conceal his contempt for the booby squires who muffed the nation's affairs at Westminster, and the liberal mind is prepared for the worst. What emerges, somewhat surprisingly, is an impeccable exposition of the virtues of high wages on the Dutch model. 'Wherever wages are high, universally throughout the whole world, it is an infallible evidence of the riches of that country; and wherever wages for labour run low it is proof of the poverty of that place.'

That the views of Child and his followers did not by any means extinguish the older view of the trade balance or the hopes of those who believed it could be calculated is seen from the contemporary debates on the establishment of the Board of Trade and the Inspector-General of Customs, and from the title of Brewster's *Fifth Essay* of 1702: *That the full employment of All Hands in the Nation is the Surest Way and Means to bring Bullion into the Kingdom*—a theoretical umbrella under which all shades of opinion might happily sit. But Child's proposals proved to be a matrix of opinions and policy on both of his two main counts. Over the wisdom of providing workhouses and similar institutions, many took issue sharply with him. The great debate on the poor raged for over half a century, between those who believed in workhouses and those who did not; and under interrogation by the liberal historians, neither side could escape the fate of the witness who is asked whether he has stopped beating his wife. To believe in workhouses was to invite suspicions of exploitation; to disbelieve in them is to invite the charge of callous indifference to suffering. Consider, for example, Daniel Defoe, spokesman for what he himself called 'the Middle State or—the Upper Station of Low Life', the author of *Giving Alms no Charity* (1704) and the

stoutest opponent of organized charity, often condemned as the arch exponent of selfish, middle-class prejudice. Defoe was too passionate, too inquisitive an observer of the human scene to be guilty of much consistent theorizing. Yet if he had a theory to solve the contemporary and social problem it was a theory of a large population and high wages. To this extent he followed Child: 'All the wealth of the nation and all the trade is produced by numbers of people', he wrote. His observations of the habits of workmen might be thought to point to the dangers of conspicuous consumption by the poor: he describes how he saw workmen take their wages to the ale-house, 'lie there till Monday, spend it every penny and run in debt to boot and not give a farthing of it to their families, tho' all of them had wives and children'.[1] Yet he did not draw the conclusion that the remedy lay either in lower wages or in poorhouses. Defoe wobbled on many things: on one he was rigidly consistent—that England's commercial prosperity depended on the quality of her export goods. To lower wages would reduce 'the value and goodness of the manufacture' and make them less competitive. 'If you expect the poor should work cheaper and not perform their work slighter and more overly (as we call it) and superficially, you expect what is not in the nature of the Thing—This therefore is beginning at the wrong end of trade . . .' [2] He objected to workhouses for the same reason: their subsidized inferior products would damage that reputation for quality on which English prosperity rested. Logically, he raised no objection to welfare schemes that provided for destitute women or half-wit children. It would, of course, be as false to suggest that everything that was said in the debate of the poor can be regarded as pointing to the Welfare State of the mid-twentieth century as it would to condemn the speakers for consigning the poor wilfully to universal pauperdom and Gin Lane. The 'hard tone' presaging the dismal science at its most arid, which even Cunningham detected in the opponents of charity in these years, is not wholly imaginary. 'When a man is perfectly content with the state he is in,' said Locke, 'what action, what industry, what will is there left but to continue in it?' One of Mandeville's works bore the title *Content the Bane of Industry*, while his *Essay on Charity* (1723) made a bitter attack on those

[1] Quoted in J. Sutherland, *Defoe* (1950), p. 130.
[2] Defoe, *Plan of the English Commerce* (1728 edn.), p. 60.

tradesmen, like Firmin, who sponsored charitable institutions out of the hope of gain and that satisfaction 'which delights mean people in governing others'. It will be noticed, all the same, that it is not the merchant writers but the philosophers who speak in the sharpest tones. Here, as not uncommonly, it was logic—the logic of clerks who believed that they had discovered the *spirtuis movens* of economic action in human egoism—that put the acid into contemporary social thought. When Pope celebrated the new principles of domestic policy and human conduct in the *Essay on Man*, he learnt them not from his father, a devoutly Roman Catholic linen draper, but from Bolingbroke and Christchurch. Yet it would be as presumptuous to withhold from the poet and philosopher his claim to sincerity as it would be uncharitable to exonerate the merchant *ex officio* from the charge of compassion. While the spiritual fathers of *laissez-faire* were busily proving the mischief of supposing that anything should or could be done, the tradesmen—Child the Grand Cham of the India Company, Firmin the London mercer, Cary the Bristol sugar merchant, Bellers the Quaker clothier, Nelson the heir to a Levant Company fortune—were pressing on with their schemes for institutions, and helping to foot the bill. And if some, like Mandeville, impugned their motives, there were others, like Davenant, who remarked contrariwise on the 'malignant temper in some who will not let a public work go on, if private persons are to be the gainers by it . . .'[1] Not all private vices, it appeared, conferred public benefits.

Historians have underestimated the gravity and oversimplified the complexity of the great debate of the poor. Faced by the difficulty of analysing the relation between states of mind and private interests, between thoughts and actions, they have too often been satisfied with what are fundamentally *a priori* conclusions. It is now apparent that between the Restoration and (say) the end of the Seven Years' War England faced a chronic problem of poverty which affected severely somewhere between a quarter and a half of the whole population. It was not only the large number of real paupers but the high proportion of casual part-time workers in the nation's leading industry, clothmaking, that

[1] C. Davenant, *An Essay upon the Probable Methods of Making a People Gainers in the Balance of Trade*. Collected Works, ii. 214.

constituted the problem.[1] Gregory King's Tables included a figure of over a million and a quarter for 'cottagers, paupers, vagrants, gypsies, thieves, beggars' out of a total of five and a half million in 1688. Population growth and industrial change had faced seventeenth-century England with a social problem that the Middle Ages had never known: an army of workers partly or wholly dependent on a great but unstable manufacturing export industry. One of the motives behind the mercantilist urge to diversify the nation's industries had been the consciousness that fluctuations in the demand for cloth might (as Mun put it) 'suddenly cause much poverty and dangerous uproars, specially by our poor people'. Politics and Nature had combined to endorse his warning. At home and abroad wars had continually disrupted markets and it is at least arguable that at two points—1652 and 1665—the decision to fight the Dutch may have been influenced by the belief that the trade depression might thereby be relieved. Vigorous industries in Holland and France were now competing for Europe's shrunken cloth markets and Colbert had placed the forces of the state in the balance. By the end of the century, the structure of the industry was adjusting itself to the stresses of the times. The less competitive areas of the West Country were yielding ground to East Anglia, as both these areas were in the eighteenth century to yield to the Yorkshire industry. On an industrial pattern already distorted by human violence must be superimposed the effects of the disastrous harvests which supervened from time to time. 1649, for example, a year of regicide, mutiny, disorder and upheaval, was also visited by an appalling harvest that drove up grain prices to famine heights and added to the grievous trade depression.[2] On top of the French wars of the '90's came especially bad harvests in 1692, 1693, 1695, 1698, 1708 and 1709. The severity of the hardship created by these conjunctions of normal and exceptional stresses undoubtedly helped to

[1] D. C. Coleman, 'Labour in the English Economy of the 17th Century', *Econ. Hist. Review*, 2nd series, viii (1956).

[2] For an account of the depression of 1649 see evidence of Thomas Violet given before Parliamentary Committee of enquiry, *State Papers Dom., 1650*, p. 178, no. 61. The evidence of depression is discussed in C. Wilson, *Profit and Power* (1957), pp. 147–9. For the depression of the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries see Beloff, *op. cit.*, ch. iii, esp. pp. 56–8. For a general discussion of the intellectual ferment of 1649 see Gooch and Laski, *English Democratic Ideas in the 17th Century* (Cambridge, 1927), esp. ch. vii.

deflect the course of economic thought. The very confusion of 1649 made it an *annus mirabilis* for the literature of social criticism and reform, much of it pivoting upon the problems of poverty. The only one to have achieved any kind of notoriety is Winstanley's *Declaration from the Poor Oppressed People of England* denouncing 'particular property'. For Winstanley, the rebel against reality, there was no question of compromise; to that extent he is less important in this inquiry than others less intransigent—Hartlib, Rice Bush, Chamberlen or Goffe, for example. Theirs was not the pure milk of utopianism. They were, on the contrary, anxious to come to terms with social reality. Hartlib, the friend of Milton and many of the revolutionary leaders, educationally the disciple of Comenius, had already published in 1641 his *Description of the Kingdom of Macaria, shewing its excellent government, wherein the Inhabitants live in great Prosperity, Health and Happiness.*[1] This remarkable work which followed in the footsteps (as Hartlib said) of More and Bacon, and foreshadowed Mandeville and the Physiocrats, was followed in 1649 by *London's Charitie stilling the Poor Orphans' Cry* and in 1650 by *London's Charity Inlarged.* Here he outlines a scheme of Parliamentary provision of workhouses to employ poor people and educate poor children. This in turn reflected the influence of a pamphlet by Rice Bush called *The Poor Man's Friend* which described the efforts of the 'many worthy citizens of London' to provide for the poor and was dedicated to a group of 'eleven gentlemen' (including Hartlib) who were said to have been active in this work.[2] Peter Chamberlen, the author of *The Poor Man's Advocate, or England's Samaritan*, which appeared in the same year, was, like Samuel Hartlib, of immigrant stock.[3] Here again were proposals, mercantilist in character, for a general increase in wealth which would also provide for the poor and narrow the socially dangerous gap that divided them from the rest of society. It is more difficult to put a certain date to William Goffe's *How to*

[1] *Harleian Miscellany* (London, 1744), i. 567. I am much indebted to Dr. Leon Fuz for allowing me to see the text of his doctoral thesis submitted at the Rotterdam Hogeschool in June 1951, in which he examines English welfare economics from Francis Bacon to Adam Smith.

[2] See G. H. Turnbull, *Hartlib, Drury and Comenius* (Liverpool, 1947), pp. 65–6.

[3] See W. Schenk. *The Concern for Social Justice in the Puritan Revolution* (London, 1930), pp. 279–80.

Advance the Trade of the Nation and employ the Poor, but internal evidence suggests that it appeared at about the same time as Chamberlen's work.[1] Like Chamberlen, Goffe proposes measures by the state of a kind a Keynesian generation was to describe as 'priming the pump'. The principal object was to re-employ the poor, whose numbers he estimates at half a million. 'The poor,' wrote Goffe, 'ought to be encouraged and mercifully dealt with and kindly used, until their slow hands be brought to ready working and ought at first to have the highest price the commodity will bear to themselves.'[2] Most of the reformers were strongly influenced in this, as in so many other matters, by the example of the Dutch, whose provision for the poor offered an obvious model for others.[3]

The profusion of welfare economics of 1649 seems to me to form the basis of almost all later economic thought for more than a century. The recognition that the problem of poverty, employment and national welfare are all linked together was never subsequently lost sight of. It was to appear again whenever bad times provoked men to brood on social remedies. 1659, a bad year, brought forth Cornelius Plockhoy's *A Way Propounded to Make the Poor in This and Other Nations Happy*.[4] Between then and the crisis of the '90's writers like Child, Matthew Hale, Robert Harford, Firmin, Davenant, Yarranton, Locke and others developed the theme.[5] The debate was resumed at full length between 1692 and 1709 with the new editions of Child's *Discourse*. John Bellers published his *Proposals for a College of Industry* in 1695, and two years later his *Epistle to Friends Concerning the Education of Children*. There is a strong general resemblance between these

[1] *Harleian Miscellany*, iv. 366–70.

[2] Quoted by T. E. Gregory in 'The Economics of Employment in England, 1660–1713', *Economica*, i (1921–2). The pamphlet is, as stated above, of an earlier date than the Restoration.

[3] See, for example, *The Dutch Drawn to the Life* (1664), ch. iv, esp. pp. 55–6.

[4] Plockhoy is often referred to as Peter Cornelius (see Gooch and Laski, *op. cit.*, pp. 117–8); Schenk (*op. cit.*, p. 153) describes him as Peter Corneliez Plockboy.

[5] E.g. Sir Matthew Hale, *Discourse Touching Provision for the Poor*, 1683. R. Harford, *Proposals for Building in every Country a Working Almshouse or Hospital as the Best Expedient to perfect the Trade and Manufactory of Linen Cloth, etc.*, 1677.

and other writings of the '90's—Dudley North's *Discourses* (1691), *Britannia Languens* (1696) and John Cary's *Essay* (1696).

Some might support and others oppose the idea of parish factories, as Defoe opposed Sir Humphrey Mackworth's Bill for those institutions in 1724, but one idea had come to be firmly established in the popular mind: the potential value of the labour represented by the nation's poor. Nor can the general approach to the problem be dismissed as merely cynical or self-interested. It had become too plain that poverty was the dominant social problem. Post-Restoration mercantilists were no longer so absorbedly preoccupied, as their predecessors had been, with state welfare measured in the narrow terms of the net amount of bullion gained or lost via the balance of trade. This traditional obsession was now blended with a concern for the social needs of the community which had its roots in the ideas of 1649. The obstinate core of mercantilist thought can nevertheless be seen in the belief that some activities were beneficial and some harmful to the community and that it was the State's task to discern and separate the two.[1]

At this point I can imagine the critics moving to their second line of defence. 'We may' (they might well say) 'have omitted to count one or two heads, neglected one or two principles. But does this affect the argument? Does not the story remain one of neglect and harshness? Even granting that their motives were less blameworthy than has sometimes been supposed, did not deeds lag a long way behind intentions?' Certainly there is no lack of evidence to substantiate the gloomiest view of society in the hundred years under review. The originals of Tom Nero, Mother Needham, Tom Idle and the rest may all be discovered in the fearful annals of St. Giles, Shoreditch, Drury Lane and Alsatia. This last century before the Industrial Revolution is near enough the present to invite comparison of its social and moral standards with those of a later day. Even now that it is a commonplace to say that the civilization of the Augustan Age was but a veneer, it comes as something of a shock to read the Report of the Commons Committee on the Care of the Poor in the Parish of St. Martin-in-the-Fields in 1715. Three-quarters out of the twelve hundred babies born every year in the parish died, many being exposed or overlaid by 'nurses'. Money was stolen, accounts were

[1] See John Cary, *Essay in the State of England, etc.*

falsified, paupers were starved and in some cases murdered. Consider the later inquiries of Jonas Hanway, Russia merchant and social reformer, founder of the Marine Society, the Magdalen House and the Foundling Hospital, and one of the most indefatigable and splendid bores of English history. His seventy-four separate works on charitable problems seem, again, to underline the failure of private enterprise to find any solution to the social problem. In the fourteen parishes investigated by him he calculated that the death-rate amongst infants entering or being born in the workhouses that had sprung up since 1720 was 88%. Some parishes (it was said) acknowledged that 'no infant had lived to be apprenticed from their workhouses'.[1] Under the system by which the poor were hired out to a contractor, the workhouse had become a place of vice, a catchall for the infant and the infirm, the able-bodied idle and the criminal alike. Some of this may have been exaggerated but much was undoubtedly true. Is the true explanation to be found (as some historians have suggested) in a decline of charity, in a harsher and more censorious attitude towards poverty and misfortune? The title of Professor Tawney's chapter on this period—'The New Medicine for Poverty'—gives a suitably sinister twist to the theme. Statistical comparisons of virtue, whether of individuals or societies, are not a promising branch of historical inquiry. But there exists one source of information as to the extent, if not the quality, of charity in England which has not (so far as I am aware) been analysed. Under the provisions of Gilbert's Act of 1782, the Ministers and Churchwardens of the parishes of England and Wales were required to make a return of all the Charitable Trusts then existing, with the date of creation, the name of the donor, the object, the capital and annual income, and the title of the Trustees responsible for administering the charity.[2] In all, some sixty or seventy thousand separate donations, mainly of seventeenth and eighteenth-century origin, were recorded. They yielded a total annual income of £258,700 spread over all the counties of England and Wales. All but £6,236 came from English returns—a capital value all told of some £5 million in the ratio of £5 worth of land for every £1

[1] See J. H. Hutchins, *Jonas Hanway 1712–86* (London, 1940), pp. 47–75.

[2] *Abstract of Returns made by Ministers and Churchwardens of the Several Parishes and Townships of England and Wales. Ordered, by the House of Commons, to be printed, 1816.*

of other types of investment. The majority of the benefactors defined their intentions only in general terms: food and clothing or fuel for the poor. A few were more specific. These poor were to have beef, those herrings; some got linen, others woollens. Poor men were to have coats, or shirts and shifts, poor women to have gowns. There was to be provision 'to marry poor maidens'. The poor here were to have Bibles, the poor children there to have books. This village was to have an almshouse, another a charity school. Mr. Tomkins of Abingdon would relieve 'poor Dissenters (but not Papists)'. And so on. Obscurities abound. Many charities have no date. Many no doubt were omitted. There are hints at misappropriation. Of many a benefaction the authorities could only observe: 'but we do not apprehend that it was ever received'.

To interpret reliably the enormous volume of information contained in the returns calls for an intimate knowledge of local economic and social history. But by a combination of random sampling and parochial analysis some pretty reliable impressions can, I believe, be obtained. The incidence of charities is related broadly to the size and character of the geographical areas, the density of the population and the general prosperity of the town or parish. As one might expect, the City of London, the Home Counties and Midlands were relatively generously endowed. Large areas like the West Riding and rich counties like Kent come top of the income-by-county analysis. To prepare any definitive analysis would require far more study than I have been able to give for the purpose of this paper. The brief survey that has been undertaken does not, however, provide any warrant for supposing that the well-to-do were left any less charitably disposed by the social, economic and religious changes in the half-century that followed the Restoration. There was undoubtedly some gradual decline—perhaps 10% to 20%—between the *average* number of trusts created in the half-century before, and the half-century after, 1660. A similar fall occurred in the following fifty years. Josiah Child has himself remarked that 'formerly in the days of our pious ancestors the work was done but now charity is decreased'; but he goes on to explain that this did not proceed from any decline in charitableness, so much as from doubts whether it was proper that private gifts by the benevolent should reduce the poor rate levied on those with less tender consciences.[1]

[1] Child, *New Discourse* (1694), p. 84.

It could indeed hardly be expected in a period when the yield from the poor rate was raised from £665,000 to £900,000 in fifteen years (1685–1701) that private donations should not in general be affected.[1] We have seen the same phenomenon in our own day as the welfare state has extended its functions. But even this trend was not universal. Suffolk, which comes after the West Riding in the volume of charity endowment, was not amongst the largest shires and was if anything less densely populated than a number of surrounding areas.[2] Is it unreasonable to suggest that its position was probably related to the presence of those *entrepreneurs* of the local draperies, Old and New, of whom Unwin himself wrote so eloquently? And what of Bristol with its noble record of over six hundred charities? A high proportion—almost a third—date from the half-century after the Restoration. It was no accident that Cary was a Bristol man: Bristol was surely the most benevolent place in England. The City of London had well over a thousand trusts, of which about one-third were created between the Restoration and the Peace of Utrecht. At Norwich, too, nearly a third of the 160-odd trusts likewise dated from this period. The collective charge that a whole class was through several generations guilty of social irresponsibility must, I think, be rejected as non-proven. The social conscience of the trading classes seems to me to have been no less tender than that of their feudal predecessors in office and may in some respects have been more sensitive. For the merchant did not move in society with the unselfconscious ease of the landed magnate nor speak with the confident voice of the learned clerk. He was in general a little more anxious than they to stand well with his fellow men, and for this, less fortunate members of society had cause to be thankful. Charity might go on breaking in. His habit of discriminating between deserving and less deserving beneficiaries may register a spiritual decline when compared with that medieval almsgiving that aimed only at the moral betterment of the donor; but it is by no means certain that the change brought any one material loss.

Amongst the many uncertainties in the returns of charities one trend emerges clearly: the growing proportion of donors who felt

[1] Figures from Beloff, *op. cit.*, *passim*.

[2] H. C. Darby, *Historical Geography of England before 1800* (Cambridge, 1936), p. 524, fig. 83.

moved to endow some form of active apprenticeship or instruction for the juvenile poor, as distinct from the passive forms of relief common in earlier periods. It is a reminder that these were the early years of that remarkable movement for charity schools which was co-ordinated from 1699 by the S.P.C.K. Hundreds of thousands of children, for whom no other means of education existed, received in the thousands of such schools the rudiments of education, religion and practical training that gave them a chance to earn a living.[1] At the peak of the movement the boys went as apprentices into every kind of trade, the girls became sempstresses or domestic servants. Again, it is easy to put a cynical motive to the work, to point to the drift away from literary and religious studies to technical training and utility. Some falling away of standards there may have been. Yet the Charity Schools remain a notable instance of that principle of voluntary association which historians like Unwin and Tawney have rightly enjoined on us to behold and admire as a vital element in social development. No previous age had faced such a formidable social problem and none certainly had attempted to relieve, employ or educate an army of poor already alarmingly enlarged by natural increase. These improvisations in social service failed or fell short of their object not because of a shortage of good intentions or of money, but because the supply of those capable of organizing and administering them with reasonable efficiency, honesty and compassionate understanding was totally inadequate. To read the replies made by parish governors to Hanway is to realize how appalling were the difficulties encountered in the organization of poor relief, how rarely a parish could find a treasure like the splendid Nurse Howe of St. Mary Whitechapel, how few were the Humphrey Clinkers, how numerous the Tom Neros. To endure the continual proximity of the poor a man needed to be either especially saintly or especially impervious to human suffering, cruelty, filth and corruption. In such a situation it was not unnatural that men should lose faith in the efficacy of high principles and take refuge in the reflection that 'whate'er is best administered is best'. Yet the art of administration was equally elusive. Administration, as the modern world understands it, is a Victorian invention resting on Victorian

[1] M. G. Jones, *The Charity School Movement: A Study of 18th Century Puritanism in Action* (Cambridge, 1938), *passim.*

values: it ran counter to much that was characteristic of eighteenth-century society. Enough of the bad old days remained in 1857 to provide Charles Dickens with material for his classic satire on bureaucracy: the Circumlocution Office in *Little Dorrit*.[1] He would not have been entirely at a loss for material a century later.

The apathy, indifference and chaos of the eighteenth-century poor law was the product not of a new capitalist ethic, but of the frustration, failure and occasional panic of a generation faced by a problem beyond its power to control. The heart of the matter was contained in the title of Defoe's famous pamphlet: *Everybody's Business is Nobody's Business* (1728). This applied not only to the condition of the institutions, but to the Settlement Laws themselves. Few historians today accept Adam Smith's famous strictures in the Laws at their face value, but it was a fact that they gave local authorities powers of ejectment that at first might appear ruthless. Yet here again, the preamble to the Act which explains why the powers were deemed necessary puts the problem in a different light.[2] The provision of relief for the unemployed differed greatly between one parish and another and those parishes 'which endeavoured to do their duty in this respect were inundated by distressed paupers.' In short, what came to be regarded by later critics as a system of calculated brutality and repression arose in the first place not from unconcern or harshness, but out of a desire to protect the efforts of those local authorities who were trying hardest to improvise remedies.

Those who do not trust interventionism are apt to inveigh alternately against its wickedness and its futility. It cannot have been both. The influence of 'policy' on the labour situation in the seventeenth century may have been exaggerated;[3] certainly 'policy' was to an important extent a reflection of social facts. Yet it seems an oddly misplaced modesty in scholars to disown the historical importance of ideas. The great Debate of the Poor

[1] See Leo Silberman's introduction (1957) to *The Statesman*, by Henry Taylor, especially pp. xx to xxv. The original title of *Little Dorrit* was to have been *Nobody's Fault*.

[2] E.g. E. M. Hampson, *The Treatment of Poverty in Cambridgeshire* (Cambridge, 1934), pp. 125–6.

[3] Coleman, 'Labour in the English Economy of the 17th Century', *Econ. Hist. Review*, viii (1956).

conducted in Press, pamphlet and Parliament had helped to elucidate the importance of labour—skilled labour in particular—to the community. The facts of unemployment and poverty had joined with the ideas of educational reform that stemmed originally from Comenius and Milton and the junction stimulated a new emphasis on apprenticeship, training and skill. Later theories of labour value have their roots in these years. Yet though the debaters had broadened and socialized their criteria of the nation's economic welfare, they remained mercantilists to a man. Hartlib, for all his precocious concern with technology, monetary substitutes and the like, was not free from the orthodox preoccupation with shipping and 'dominion on the sea and thereby the strength and renown and flourishing estate of the nation'.[1] Defoe has sometimes been credited with precociously free trade views on the strength of the part he played in Harley's *Mercator*, but in fact his views remained conventionally mercantilist and protectionist.[2] Firmin was amongst the stoutest opponents of the import of French textiles. Mandeville, for all his scorn of bullionism, remained firmly anchored to the old principles, enjoining upon politicians that 'above all, they'll keep a watchful Eye over the Balance of Trade in general and never suffer that all the Foreign Commodities together, that are imported in one year, shall exceed in value what of their own growth or manufacture is in the same exported to others'.[3] The principles of *Machtpolitik* had no more single minded disciple than Jonas Hanway, who dedicated one of his principal works to Anson, the victor of Finisterre.[4] John Cary, the great Bristol merchant and philanthropist, exemplified perfectly the union of mercantilist principles with ideals of social reform. The theme of his famous *Essay* of 1695 was that some trades were profitable to the nation and should be encouraged; others were harmful and should be discouraged. In making its decisions between the two, government should be guided not so much by the net effects on the bullion

[1] Samuel Hartlib, *Legacy of Husbandry* (London, 1655), p. 292.

[2] See especially *An Humble Proposal to the People* of England in the *Works* (Oxford, 1841), xviii. 27, 41, 45.

[3] B. Mandeville, *The Fable of the Bees*, ed. F. B. Kaye, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1924), i. 116.

[4] *Historical Account of the British Trade over the Caspian Sea* (London, 1754), i. 421.

flow as by the results in terms of manufacture and employment. As an economist, Cary was heir to the ideas of Child—balance-of-trade-mercantilism modified by considerations of employment. His influence was exercised equally on trade policy and on social reform. But it was not only in England where his writings were widely distributed and read down to the mid-eighteenth century. This type of mercantilism—what might not unfairly be called 'social mercantilism'—was the most powerful formative influence on continental mercantilism in the eighteenth century. Two of the founding Fathers of German *Kameralwissenschaft*—Becher and von Schroeder—were resident in England in these years (J. J. Becher fled to England in 1680 and remained here till his death in 1685; von Schroeder lived in London from about 1663 to 1674 when he returned to Germany) and the resemblance between the 'equilibrium of occupation' of Schroeder's *Fürstliche Schatz und Rentkammer* (1686) and the ideas of Child and Cary is too close to be accidental. From this, three-quarters of a century later, came Sonnenfels's theory of the two trade balances by which economic health must be judged: the 'monetary' and the 'employment' balance. The genealogy of mercantilism in Italy is equally clear. When Genovesi came to establish a flourishing school of economics at Naples in the 1750's, he began by translating John Cary's *Essay* for his pupils' benefit, while relegating Mun's earlier work to an appendix. His own doctrine that distinguished between the 'useful commerce' which exported manufactures and the 'harmful' which brought in foreign manufactures, was the word precisely as Cary had preached it. There can be little doubt that the social and economic policy of Enlightened Despotism in Eastern Europe owed most of its theoretical foundations to English 'social mercantilism'. Even in France, the new synthesis was not without influence. De Gournay, then an *intendant* for commerce, who stood between the extremes of mercantilist and physiocratic dogma, published in 1754 a French edition of the works of Child and Culpeper.[1] In some sense, England was only paying back an intellectual debt owed to Europe. For it is a remarkable fact that not a little of the 'welfare' element in that doctrine may be traced to thinkers of European origin. Hartlib was a Pole, something of a cosmopolitan who spoke

[1] A. Oncken, *Die Maxime Laissez Faire et Laissez Passer* (Berne, 1886), pp. 87–9.

several languages including Dutch.[1] Comenius, the source of much of the educational controversy of these years, was a Czech. Chamberlen was by origin French; Plockhoy, a Zeelander. Mandeville came from Rotterdam. That the debate which had begun round the theme of wealth and conquest had broadened into a debate on social ends was not a little due to their intervention. It was not only English economic and technological organization that was leavened by immigrant influence, but English social ideas, too.[2]

At their weakest, the criticisms of the social arrangements in the post-Restoration age to which I have referred imply that at that time human nature amongst the ruling classes took a distinct turn for the worse. More charitably, we might take the theory to be that in the social situation of that time the worse side of human nature found more opportunities to exhibit itself. The evidence of the creation of charitable trusts seems to me to dispose of any sweeping allegations of this kind. It is rather evident that, on the contrary, local experiments and experiences grew into something like a social philosophy which grafted new social ends on to the older strategic and monetary objectives of mercantilist thought. There was no unanimity about the means to be employed: there was indeed a bitter and protracted debate between those who believed, with Child, that the problem of poverty demanded direct treatment—the workhouse and the spinning school—and those who believed, with Mandeville and Defoe, that this was a problem which could be dispersed only through an accelerated rate of economic activity in general. The alignment of supporters, it is plain, can in no way be explained in terms of economic interest; and the ranks of those who took what has often been regarded as the tough line included many (like Dr. Johnson) who qualify neither as Capitalists nor as Puritans and who can hardly be accused of inhumanity. Both sides recognized that the employment of the poor—and especially their skilled employment—was an objective to be pursued as a means to the prosperity of individuals and of society; but many recognized that it was, besides,

[1] Turnbull, *op. cit.* See the same author's *Samuel Hartlib. A Sketch of His Life and Relations to J. A. Comenius* (Oxford, 1920); also Brit. Mus., Sloane MSS. 654, fos. 345–8.

[2] For the influence of immigrants on technology, etc., see, e.g., W. Cunningham, *Alien Immigrants* (Cambridge, 1897).

a social and religious duty. Here was, in fact, not the monotone of repression, but the antiphony of a genuine debate in which the claims of material interest and social welfare were mixed in proportions not discreditable to the age. To administrators and thinkers in the less fortunate, more backward states of Middle and South Europe, such arguments seemed to be the talisman of English progress. Writing later in the eighteenth century Hannah More described the period we have been examining as 'an age of benevolence'. Perhaps the *Bas Bleu* was predisposed in favour of the paternalism for which her native Bristol was famous. But her verdict is entitled to respect, especially as it seems that the opposite conclusion has been reached by the device of peopling the post-Restoration scene with selected cartoon figures more appropriate to the comedy of Congreve or Wycherley than to serious historical study. As historians we might do well to ponder what an eminent critic has written of this technique of caricature as it was employed by the dramatists of the Restoration: 'It is in a sense prig-drama. It flatters the vanity of the spectator for whose amusement the weaknesses of his friends are held up.' [1] It is true that there is weighty authority for the view that it is the historian's task to sit in judgment. 'Morality,' said Sir Thomas Browne, 'is not ambulatory', and Acton invoked his support for the view that the historian should err on the side of severity rather than risk the moral perils of leniency.[2] But Acton also saw the dangers that arise from haste and prejudice. The 'weighing of testimony' was for him the vital part of the historian's task.[3] There is not, after all, much fundamental difference between that and Professor Butterfield's injunction: 'to surround the man with all that can be gathered in the way of historical explanation'.[4] When Acton spoke,[5] the impact of the social sciences on the study of history in England was but recent. When historians spoke of moral judgments they still thought of the actions of individuals, and principally of rulers and statesmen who were conceived to have shaped the course of events. It is different with the sociologized history of our own day which is less concerned with individuals and more with men as members of social groups. It

[1] Bonamy Dobree, *Restoration Comedy 1660–1720* (Oxford, 1924), p. 11.
[2] *Lectures on Modern History*, (1930 edn.), p. 28.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 16.
[4] *History and Human Relations* (1951), p. 119.
[5] June 1895.

is curious that the socially-scientific historians began by glibly ordering men's characters according to their occupations and ended by dispatching to collective perdition whole classes of men throughout several generations on the strength of evidence which the late Judge Lynch might have hesitated to regard as adequate. So far from reducing the need to weigh the testimony, this new sociological trend in historical technique makes it all the more imperative, lest history should sink to the rough justice and intellectual shallowness of a standardized political conflict.

COUNTY POLITICS AND A PURITAN CAUSE CÉLÈBRE: SOMERSET CHURCHALES, 1633

The Alexander Prize Essay

By Thomas G. Barnes, A.B., D.Phil.

READ 14 JUNE 1958

THE origins of that strange amalgam of constitutional and religious issues which provoked England's civil war have not yet been fathomed. The painstaking researches of the historians of parliament have established that from early in Elizabeth's reign, the Commons assumed an increasingly Puritan complexion; from the 1621 Parliament until the last stormy session before the Personal Rule, the constitutional crisis came forward to meet and merge with the religious in the first of the three stirring resolutions voted by an expiring Commons in defiance of Mr. Speaker. Yet, the identification of sacred concerns with secular by the few hundred who sat in St. Stephen's was not the norm for the greater England beyond Westminster. Parliament had moved further and faster in the 1620's than had the country, the constitutional questions alone having been bruited about the countryside. The religious issue—the growing divergence in faith and practice within the Church—had not been generally perceived by a nation largely unaware of Laud and his adherents on the one hand and the 'Preciser sort' of Puritans on the other.[1] During the Personal Rule, however, the religious issue became a matter of common knowledge, concern, rumour, and

[1] The narrowness of the term 'Laudian', which caused Professor W. K. Jordan to reject it in his *Development of Religious Toleration in England, 1603–1640*, (1936), p. 115, n. 1, induces me to use it in preference to other terms such as 'High Church', 'Anglo-Catholic', and 'Arminian' which are either in current use in another context or inaccurate. The more Catholic group in the Church, while it had come into existence before Laud's eminence, was peculiarly his instrument during the 1630's. 'Preciser sort,' in common use then, is taken to identify the extreme Puritan wing of the Church, often not clearly enough distinguished from the moderate Puritans. My thanks are due to my colleague, Professor R. E. Cogswell, for his stylistic criticism of this paper.

controversy. Under the impact of Laudianism, Puritanism grew more extremist.[1] The inexorable destruction of the Elizabethan settlement, ground between an ever more rigid orthodoxy and an increasingly radical heterodoxy, forced the countryman to choose sides in matters religious. Once the identification of religious heterodoxy with political opposition was accomplished, the necessary ingredients for civil war were mixed, awaiting only the loosening of royal and episcopal authority in the Long Parliament in order to work their destructive ends. Therefore, the origins of the amalgam should be searched for in the era of Personal Rule, in the counties of England rather than in the Westminster of a darkened Commons house. This essay does not purport to uncover those origins; that must await a fuller study of the political and religious complexions of England's counties. In treating what was the earliest instance of Archbishop Laud's demand for uniformity throughout the whole Church, it is intended that an understanding of the incident, the forces behind it, and their implications might serve as a guide to those willing to undertake the greater task.

The churchales controversy at the outset was singularly prosaic as *causes célèbres* go. It was limited to one county, which while not the meanest, was still only one of many. Arising from a clash between the prelatical pretensions of Laud and the jurisdictional powers of a judge on assize circuit, it rapidly became a gathering point for personal animosities and factional rivalries doing battle in the county. When it began, the churchales controversy touched the vital interests of merely a few. When it ended in regal censure of the lord chief justice of England, the reissue of the king's declaration on lawful Sunday sports, and the persecution of those clergy who would not conform to it, the churchales controversy had become a matter of national import. Coinciding with attainment of primatial power by Laud, it offered the first opportunity of his primacy to require and enforce a uniformity in practice throughout the English Church by scotching the 'Preciser sort' who stood in the way. It found its last, notorious echo in 1643 as evidence against the defendant in the impeachment of the hapless archbishop.[2]

[1] Jordan, *op. cit.*, p. 163.

[2] William Prynne, *Canterburies Doome* (1646), between pp. 128 and 149, contains the Commons' case against Laud *vis-à-vis* churchales. When

All that can be discovered about the county's religious attitudes would indicate that Somerset was most unlikely to provide the arena for a Puritan incident. It had skirted the extremes of religious difference such as the Romanist adherence of the North and the advanced, continentally oriented Puritanism of East Anglia.[1] Somerset was predominantly Puritan, but only in so far as a compound of loathing for Roman Catholicism and an acceptance of the tenets of Calvinism can be termed Puritan. Communion was apparently celebrated infrequently in most churches, and then over a deal table in the nave; this probably being not so indicative of positive Puritan commitment as it was of an understandable ignorance of the eucharist's sacramental quality. The clergy were the undistinguished residue of the Erastian pressures of the Elizabethan settlement. Many of them were university graduates, but they were certainly not always above moral reproach or so intent upon saving souls as were their reformed brethren on the continent.[2] They were acceptable to their flocks on those grounds, and there was a sufficiently strong undercurrent of healthy disrespect for the clergy to banish sacerdotalism. Good preachers among them were evidently rare, though in James's reign a few unbeneficed 'lecturers' had drifted into the county. Doubtless, the numbers of the lecturers were limited by economic circumstances. The common folk grumbled enough about any call upon their financial resources to supply evidence of their general unwillingness to support even the most creditable supernumerary savers of souls, and the solid gentry of Somerset were by and large not so struck with a preaching clergy

checked against manuscript sources, Prynne's transcriptions of documents are quite accurate, though his chronology is utterly confused. Typographical errors in pagination make reference difficult—page references as given should be taken to lie between pp. 128 and 149. Prynne's account is indispensable for certain incidents, though he over-colours them.

[1] Som[erset] R[ecord] O[ffice], Sessions rolls, presentments of non-attenders, 1625–1640, and P[ublic] R[ecord] O[ffice], E. 377/33 to 48 (recusant rolls, Pipe Office series) indicate the absence of any real problem of Roman Catholic recusancy.

[2] The copious files of the late I. FitzRoy Jones which are now in the Som.R.O. provide invaluable information on Somerset incumbents. The Sessions rolls provide occasional glimpses of immoral clergy, such as ministers who fathered illegitimate children, Som.R.O., Sess. rolls, 63, ii, no. 144, and 63, i, no. 27.

as to undertake the maintenance of private chaplains.[1] The 'Preciser sort' of clergy were few in number, usually beneficed, and thus likely to be outwardly amenable to the views of their secular patrons and the will of their ordinary. At least until 1635 they operated wholly within the ecclesiastical structure, conventicles being not at all in evidence. The Laudian clergy were even fewer in number. Despite the strenuous efforts of Laud's faithful protégé, Bishop Pierce of Bath and Wells, in Somerset as elsewhere even at the zenith of Laud's power in Church and state, Laudianism lacked parochial roots.[2] For the vast majority of Somerset men, the Church as it stood with all its contradictions, laxity, and spiritual shortcomings, was satisfactory. The prevailing attitude found expression in the stated reasons of the Beckington churchwardens for having refused Bishop Pierce's injunction to move the communion table to the east end; invoking the blood of the Protestant martyrs, the churchwardens declared: 'Wee expect noe change of Religion (blessed be God).'[3] In such an atmosphere, 'Sabbath' was a word only slightly less repugnant than 'altar'. This traditionally Erastian, conservative spiritual outlook was not likely to be stirred by a call to arms against the 'unholy' Sunday revels, churchales. Nor, indeed, was it.

The churchale, a crude precursor of today's sedate parish fête, was held after evening prayer on a Sunday near to the dedication day of the parish church, or on any other convenient Sunday during the warmer months. It served both as a convivial gathering and also as a means to raise money for the church or some other worthy cause.[4] A typical Brueghel scene of a Flemish village

[1] There were exceptions, such as a Jacobean J.P., Sir Edward Hext, who bequeathed an endowment for a preacher in his church at Low Ham, *Som. Arch. & Nat. Hist. Soc. Proceedings*, XL, i. 33.

[2] See Pierce's notice in *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, xv (1917 ff.), pp. 1158–60. The diocese of Bath and Wells and the county of Somerset are virtually coterminous.

[3] P.R.O., S.P. 16/375, no. 84, [1635] (State Papers Domestic, Charles I). The Beckington affair has been termed the 'classical instance' of the impact of visitation articles on parochial life and the altar controversy, G. W. O. Addleshaw and F. Etchells, *The Architectural Setting of Anglican Worship* (1948), pp. 128–9. This was the only such incident in Somerset.

[4] 'Churchale' was the generic term for any such celebration in the churchyard, though the peculiarly West Country 'revel' was the same. The 'wake' was the dedication day revel. A 'bidale' was given for the benefit of some villager, well-liked and impoverished. The 'clerkale' provided funds for the

festival will pass for an English churchale. The order of the day was feasting, dancing, and strenuous exercises such as wrestling and noisily carrying men about the churchyard on a bouncing 'cavell staff'—all pitched upon with a boisterousness induced by the consumption of considerable quantities of country ale, in some cases brewed by the parson himself especially for the occasion. Music was provided by wandering minstrels, while for the spectator-minded, bear-baiting and bull-baiting afforded entertainment more of bravado than blood. Though these country showmen were technically rogues and vagabonds and thereby subject to the rigours of the law, the law was indifferently enough enforced and their services well enough requited so that no churchale failed of their presence.[1] As could be expected, order was not always preserved at these gatherings, the narrow line between amity and truculence being drawn thin by drink. Brawling often ensued, in which persons were sometimes injured, on one or two occasions, killed. Licentiousness was widely felt to accompany the revels, and a few known cases of illegitimate children begotten at churchales gave credence to the belief. None the less, the disorderly conduct too readily associated with churchales might have been more apparent than real.[2] That churchales were popular is unquestionable. For the country parson a churchale was a means to raise money for the repair of the church fabric, or to provide better for his ubiquitous assistant, the parish clerk.[3] For the squire, it afforded a rare opportunity

parish clerk. Bishop Kennet's *Parochial Antiquities* (1685) deals with the history of churchales and their seventeenth-century aspect.

[1] A professional bull-baiter received the comfortable sum of £3 12s. 4d. from five churchales in Somerset, Dorset, and Wiltshire during the summer of 1607, Som.R.O., Sess. rolls, 2, no. 64.

[2] After consulting every information and examination involving crime sent to Somerset quarter sessions for trial, 1625–1640, I have found only one churchale disturbance among them; see p. 116, n. 1. These documents are complete for the period, preserved in Som.R.O., Sess. rolls. While almost all such disturbances would have gone to quarter sessions, murders and manslaughters committed there would go to assizes. The absence of criminal records for the Western Circuit before 1654 makes it impossible to determine with any accuracy how many churchales ended in violent death. The 'riots, disorders, murders' and similar in petitions against churchales were formulae, not always relevant or based on fact.

[3] The net profit to the parish from a churchale had declined considerably, from £10–£20 to £4–£5, between the early sixteenth and early seventeenth

to move easily and amicably among his lessers, displaying his indisputable superiority by stooping to conquer. The rank and file of the village welcomed a revel as a relief from the monotony of agrarian life, and to them it was an event so personal and homely as to be uniquely the village holiday. There was truth in Bishop Pierce's defence of churchales, that they served to compose differences among neighbours and exerted a civilizing influence as well as providing necessary recreation. Despite their unattractive features, the revels served a useful, even benevolent, function in rural society.

Certain other considerations recommended churchales to the Laudians. The emphasis in Archbishop Laud's visitation articles of 1634 on the better upkeep of the church fabric indicates the value that he would place on a relatively painless way to collect money for that purpose.[1] In a letter to Laud, Bishop Pierce touched upon another good reason for encouraging churchales and other Sunday sports: if the people did not have their lawful recreations on Sunday after evening prayer, they would go either into alehouses and there talk of matters of Church and state, or else into conventicles.[2] The impression remains, however, that the Laudians' paramount interest in churchales stemmed from the 'Preciser sort's' dislike of them.

The 'Preciser sort' viewed churchales with loathing, considering them profane orgies which desecrated the 'Sabbath', gave rise to every conceivable sin, drew the people away from the Word (churchales fell during hours when the lecturers were active), and sapped their spiritual vitality, thus opening the way for Popery. The vehemence of these extremists made up for their lack of numbers, and their continuous campaign against revels must have had some effect at least on those responsible for all but two of the orders suppressing churchales, the justices of the peace. None of the justices can be identified with the extremists, though some would have had mixed feelings about the propriety of revels.[3]

centuries, W. Notestein, *The English People on the Eve of Colonization* (1954), pp. 244–5. The sale of ale provided the largest return.

[1] S.P. 16/63, no. 88, for the printed visitation articles of 1634 for Bath and Wells. Bishop Pierce noted in 1634 that East Coker church had been repaired by the proceeds of a churchale seven years before, S.P. 16/353, no. 13.

[2] S.P. 16/250, no. 20, 5 Nov. 1633.

[3] Churchale disturbers could have hoped for little leniency at the hands of John Harington of Kelston, chairman of quarter sessions and a devout

Evidently, in the minds of most of them there was no connexion between churchales and the revival of Popery, while the antiquity of the festivities recommended them to gentlemen highly traditional in their outlook. Fox-hunting squires (and Sunday was as good a day as any other for the chase) were not likely to deny the common folk their Sunday sport on the grounds of spiritual decency. What most concerned the magistrates was the danger inherent in churchales of breaches of the peace and contraventions of the restrictions on the sale of drink. With the sole exception of the 1628 assize order, all the Somerset quarter sessions and assize orders against churchales appear to have grown from these concerns rather than any dislike for churchales as profanations of the Sabbath. The first extant order prohibiting churchales, that of the justices of the peace at the Michaelmas sessions 1594, was a mere prohibition without reason given.[1] The second order, that of Michaelmas sessions 1596, was wholly predicated on the need to restrict the selling of ale. The Epiphany sessions 1608 order was a renewal of the former prohibitions and extended them to bull-baitings, bear-baitings, etc.; it was the justices' reaction to a particularly rowdy churchale presented at that sessions and the confession of a professional bull-baiter heard there. The Easter sessions 1624 order merely ordered all churchales to be suppressed, and while the reasoning behind it is not given, one may surmise that a reminder to the justices that churchales were still forbidden, even though previous orders had not been enforced, accounted for the new order. Only the 1628 order of Baron Denham at the Lent assizes exhibited pressure against churchales ostensibly on religious grounds. Reminding the judge that at the Devon assizes

Puritan rigidly opposed to all ungodliness, though not an extremist, Brit. Mus., Egerton MS. 2711, Harington's commonplace book. The dean of Wells and the city's recorder (both county J.P.s) made a bastardy order in which the parents were to be whipped to the playing of two fiddles to make known that they had begot the child on the 'Sabbath' while coming from dancing, Som.R.O., Quarter sessions order book, 1613–1620, midsummer Q.S. 1617, ord. no. 8.

[1] Following are the Somerset assize (asz.) and quarter sessions (Q.S.) orders prohibiting churchales: 1594, Q.S., S.P. 16/96, no. 7; 1596, Q.S., Prynne, *Canterburies Doome*, p. 152; 1608, Q.S., Som.R.O., Sess. rolls, 2, no. 77; 1624, Q.S., Som.R.O., Qtr. sess. ord. bk., 1620/1–1627, Easter Q.S. 1624, ord. no. 4; 1628, asz., Som.R.O., Sess. rolls, 61, i, no. 74. Orders were made against churchales in Devon (by assizes and sessions) in 1599, 1606, 1615, 1627. The 1628 assize order was applied to Dorset.

on the previous circuit he had ordered the suppression of all churchales in that county, six Somerset clergymen prayed that a like order be made for Somerset.[1] Their petition made no mention of motives, though their reference to 'ales and disorders' and their vocation would indicate a religious intent. Denham probably made the order requested primarily to establish a uniform policy in the matter in the circuit; perhaps, too, the more important justices of the peace sitting with him urged him to that course as sanction for the sessions' policy. The order's continuity with its predecessors for Somerset and Devon is demonstrated by the emphasis in the prohibition on the disorder attendant upon revels and the necessity for the 'farther prevention of such inconveniences as usually happen at such meetings'.[2] There is no reason to believe that this order was any better enforced than its predecessors despite the weightier judicial authority behind it. Indeed, the lax application of the recurrent prohibitions leads one to conclude that they were intended more to contain churchales within limits of reasonable good order than to abolish them altogether. If abolition was intended, it was neither accomplished nor even attempted.

The churchales controversy was touched off by an order of Baron Denham at the Somerset Lent assizes in March 1632, exactly the same as the one he had made four years before. Allowing for considerable exaggeration in Prynne's use of descriptive words, one may credit his statement that at the assizes there were 'many' indicted for murdering illegitimate children conceived at churchales, and that the justices of the peace 'earnestly importuned' the judge to make an order against revels.[3] The order was duly enrolled among the routine orders of the assize. Unexpectedly, it raised a sharp reaction from William Laud, bishop of London. Having been informed of the provision in the order requiring every incumbent to read it to his parishioners once a year on the first Sunday in February, Laud complained to the

[1] S.P. 16/96, no. 7. [2] Som.R.O., Sess. rolls, 61, i, no. 74.

[3] Prynne, *op. cit.*, p. 128. The order is in P.R.O., Asz. 24/20 (assize order book, Western Circuit, 1629–1640), fo. 49v. Both Prynne and Heylyn, *Cyprianus Anglicanus* (1668), p. 256, incorrectly state that Richardson made the order. Denham, B., at the Dorset assizes, autumn 1631, made an order prohibiting churchales, but expressly omitted the requirement of publication by the clergy, P.R.O., Asz. 24/20, fo. 35v.

king that the judge's injunction to the clergy was an invasion of the diocesan's jurisdiction.[1] Charles listened with a ready ear, and though Bishop Pierce (the diocesan) was not consulted as to his wishes, Chief Justice Richardson and Baron Denham were given strict charge before the Lent circuit 1633 to revoke all orders prohibiting churchales.

Richardson wilfully disobeyed the king's instructions. At the Dorset assizes, he 'gaily' revoked the prohibitions, but at the Somerset assizes he did not make the required repeal.[2] Rather, he upbraided a constable who inquired whether the former orders were to remain in force.[3] Laud having got wind of his disobedience, a letter under the sign-manual dated 2 May 1633 was addressed to Sir Robert Phelips, Sir Henry Berkeley, and the Rev. Dr. Paul Godwin, justices of the peace of Somerset, requiring them to certify what direction Chief Justice Richardson had given at the last assizes for the revocation of orders prohibiting churchales.[4]

What had originated as a dispute between an ambitious and increasingly powerful prelate and an obstinate judge over the question of ecclesiastical jurisdiction, now became a matter of county politics in which the initiative had shifted to a powerful figure in county life, Sir Robert Phelips. Son of Sir Edward Phelips, master of the rolls and speaker of the 1614 Parliament, Sir Robert had been a figure of national importance when a parliamentary career beginning in 1603 reached fruition in the parliaments of the 1620's. In 1621, Phelips had been the prime harrier of Mompesson and Bacon. At the Oxford session of Charles's first parliament, 'he virtually assumed that unacknowledged leadership which was all that the traditions of Parliament at that time permitted'.[5] In the exalted company of Coke and Wentworth he was pricked for sheriff in 1626 to exclude him from the second

[1] Laud's apologist, Heylyn (*op. cit.*, pp. 256–7), agrees substantially with Prynne that Laud's main exception to the order at this time was the matter of jurisdiction. As bishop of London, Laud had prevented the lord mayor from making like use of the clergy.

[2] Som.R.O., Phelips MSS., Musters 1615–1667, fo. 137 [hereafter, Som.R.O., DD/PH].

[3] *Ibid.*, fo. 136. Richardson suspected Sir Robert Phelips had moved the constable to ask the question!

[4] S.P. 16/238, no. 4; original in Som.R.O., DD/PH, fo. 120.

[5] S.R. Gardiner, *History of England 1603–1640* (1899), v. 432.

parliament. In the last parliament before the Personal Rule, Phelips was still in the forefront of parliamentary opposition though he had lost his place of leadership to Eliot. Accounted one of the more Puritan-inclined members, recurrently in a state of ill-grace with the government, Phelips was the last man in Somerset that one would have expected to see chosen as informant upon a disobedient judge of assize.

The explanation of Phelips's stand in the matter is the key to the controversy and its most significant feature. Gardiner's contention that Phelips like Wentworth embraced apostasy after the dissolution in 1629, is unfounded.[1] As he had been an outspoken opponent of Bacon, Montague, and Buckingham in parliament as well as a leader in the county's agitation against the 1625 free-gift, so in the later 1630's he led Somerset's opposition to shipmoney. Phelips's inclination to remove himself from the opposition once parliament was dissolved and play the dutiful county magistrate from 1629 until he first raised Somerset against shipmoney in 1635, grew from a desire to consolidate his considerable following among the freeholding and petty-gentry elements in the shire. Like every member in the Commons of the 1620's who had tasted the fame of a parliamentary career and missed it following 1629, Phelips believed that another parliament was just around the corner. To assure himself of the electoral following that would seat him for the county, he recognized he must strive constantly to be the single greatest power in the county. Parliament or no parliament, predominance in the county was satisfying in itself. From 1626 to 1628, Phelips had been omitted from the commission of the peace and excluded from his deputy lieutenancy because of his vociferous opposition to royal policy and the machinations of his rival for county supremacy. Almost costing him his county following, this sojourn in the political wilderness had chastened Sir Robert. After a brief imprisonment during the 1628 Parliament, he was once again a county magnate by virtue of the offices he held in the county, this time determined not to fall again from royal grace or lose the county offices requisite to county supremacy.

[1] S. R. Gardiner, *History of England 1603–1640* (1899), vii. 319. This account is drawn largely from the valuable papers of Sir Robert Phelips contained principally in five large volumes of the Phelips MSS. in the Somerset Record Office.

Richardson's disobedience afforded Phelips a chance to demonstrate his new-found affection for the king's service. Phelips had probably informed Westminster in the first place of Richardson's insubordination, the king's instructions to him and his two close friends, Berkeley and Godwin, merely formalizing the information as well as requiring further intelligence.[1] While securing for him royal favour, Phelips's rôle as *agent provocateur* afforded him great personal satisfaction. At assizes in the previous year, Richardson had dismissed a prosecution pressed by Phelips of a minor gentleman, John Boyse, who had contemptuously refused to comply with a magisterial order made by Phelips. Boyse had compounded his offence by noising about the countryside, even at courts-leet, that he was as good as Phelips, that Phelips was a liar, an idol of the common people.[2] This no county magnate could endure, and Phelips had relied upon Richardson to crush Boyse. Instead, the chief justice allowed Boyse to go scot-free without a public apology to Sir Robert. This called down upon him the wrath of the magnate, who accused Richardson of partiality and wilful concealment of the truth.[3] Phelips's vindication by the Council, which ordered Boyse's punishment and required of him a public apology to Phelips, was a reflection upon Richardson. Richardson was by nature quick-tempered and slow to cool, wont to jeer at those in his power, and not one to allow any affront to go unavenged.[4] He hated Phelips; a sentiment requited by Sir Robert, who determined to let slip no opportunity to break Richardson once and for all.

One final element in the political picture must be fitted into place to make it wholly comprehensible. Sir Robert Phelips in his quest for supremacy in the county had one implacable rival, John Lord Poulett of Hinton St. George. Lord Poulett was the only peer resident in the county, and a new-risen one at that. He had been created baron in 1627 after considerable fawning before Buckingham, entertainment of the king, and a year's arduous

[1] Gardiner states (*op. cit.*, vii. 319) that Phelips informed Laud of the order at the outset, which is not impossible though I have found no proof of it. But see p. 111, n. 3, for Richardson's suspicion.

[2] Phelips on Boyse: 'So impudent, so proud, and so insufferable a piece of humanity dyd I never know in these or any other parts.' Som.R.O., DD/PH, fos. 145 ff.

[3] *Ibid.*, fos. 145 ff.

[4] J. M. Rigg's notice of Richardson in *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, xvi. 1133–4, provides good insight into his character.

service at Charles's request as host-cum-gaoler to the embarrassing Huguenot exile, Monsieur de Soubise. Like Phelips, Poulett was the scion of an Elizabethan official; like Phelips, he felt that supremacy social and political in Somerset was his birthright. He and Phelips had crossed swords first in the county election of 1614, when his alliance with the prestigious Sir Maurice Berkeley (Sir Henry's father), the machinations of the sheriff, and his own disregard of his promise not to stand if Phelips announced his candidacy, secured him a county seat. The elder, parliamentary veteran and heir of the speaker was forced to scurry ignominiously to a Cornish borough seat, joining the parliament tardily as a member for Saltash.[1] Phelips never forgave Poulett this smart to his pride, and from that day until Sir Robert died in 1638 the two were locked in a continual, at times almost desperate, battle for county supremacy. They ranged behind themselves as many gentry of the magisterial group as they could, succeeding well enough to rend the county's governors into two rival factions. Their tactics differed, Phelips usually cultivating his countrymen, Poulett currying favour in court and Council. In the churchales controversy, these roles were to be reversed, but only because it served Phelips's interests to play the courtier, thus forcing Poulett to declare himself leader of the group in opposition to the royal will. For once Phelips had assumed a position, Poulett must needs stand opposite, in churchales as in all else.

The answer of Phelips, Berkeley, and Dr. Godwin to the king's letter of 2 May was highly condemnatory of Chief Justice Richardson. Drafted by Phelips, it was a truthful though coloured account of the past suppression of churchales and their many advantages.[2] The entire onus for the recent suppression was laid upon Richardson. He was accused of having quashed by undue means the Star Chamber prosecution of a constable who had allegedly broken up a private party in the belief that it was a churchale as recently prohibited by the judge. The three informants marvelled at the chief justice's neglect in not having made 'your Majesties pleasure known' at the previous assizes by repealing the prohibitions. After the receipt of this letter, Charles

[1] See Miss E. Farnham's account of the 1614 election, drawn largely from the Phelips MSS., in *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, xlvi. 579–99.

[2] Som.R.O., DD/PH, fos. 124 ff., for the first and last drafts.

personally ordered Richardson to revoke the prohibitory orders on the forthcoming circuit.

Richardson's characteristic stubbornness, his respect for the law, his hatred for Phelips, his fear of Laud's pretensions, and a strong sense of having been unjustly treated, were all manifested in Richardson's bearing at the Somerset assizes in early August 1633. Before the assembled multitude, including virtually all of the justices of the peace, the chief justice undertook a long review of the history of the suppression of churchales. He cited six precedents, orders made by former judges and justices in Somerset and Devon. He alluded to the disorderliness of churchales. He spoke slightingly of the office of bishop.[1] He went out of his way to vex Phelips, mentioning as he read the names of the Somerset justices who had signed the 1594 order, that as for Thomas Phillips (Sir Robert's uncle), 'he knew not who he was. . .' .[2] The chief justice concluded with a revocation of all former orders against churchales, those promulgated by quarter sessions as well as by assizes. The order was quite in keeping with Charles's instructions, but the prefatory remarks were neither meet nor conformable to the king's will:

> Which former Order [against revels] being warranted by so many Presidents, Judge Richardson said hee conceived hee had no power absolutely to reverse; but being commanded to do it, by His Majestie, he did as much as in him lay revoke it: but yet doubted not, that if the Justices of Peace would truely informe His Majesty of the grounds of the former order, His Majesty would give Order to revive it. . . .[3]

To incite the county gentry to express their disapprobation of a policy so fervently held by the king and his chief councillor,

[1] *Ibid.*, fo. 131, Phelips to the King, 18 Aug. 1633.

[2] Prynne, *Canterburies Doome*, p. 152. Prynne erroneously states that Thomas Phillips was Sir Robert's father.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 154. For the revocation order, see S.P. 16/255, no. 39. iv (copy). A condition to the revocation appeared in the order, *viz.* 'as much as in him [the judge] lyeth' (in brackets). This was a mere quibble—the authority of a judge of assize to overrule all previous administrative (as distinct from judicial) orders of assizes or sessions was unquestionable. This revocation order and the 1632 prohibitive order are in *Somerset Assize Orders, 1629–1640*, ed. by T. G. Barnes, Somerset Record Society, lxv (1959), nos. 42 and 78.

was not the part of a dutiful representative of the king in his shire.

Richardson went further than incitement. After assizes, he invited the justices into his chamber to sign a petition to the king praying for the suppression of churchales. The petition recited (much too luridly to be wholly agreeable with truth) the great increase over the summer of 'all the disorders of prophanation of the Lords-day, riotous tipling, contempt of authorities, quarrels, murders, etc. . . .' accompanying the revels.[1] Twenty-five justices signed, Lord Poulett and his lieutenant, Sir John Stawell, his uncle, George Poulett, and his three most constant adherents among the gentry prominent among them. Undoubtedly, Poulett saw in the petition an opportunity to score over Phelips, for if he could muster a sizeable portion of the magisterial bench behind himself and the benighted judge, he would demonstrate his unquestionable command of the county's power. It is difficult to determine how many of the other nineteen subscribers were so strongly inclined towards Poulett as to require them to range themselves opposite Sir Robert Phelips. A number of them had never exhibited much regard for him, and these might have allied themselves with Poulett from positive dislike of his opponent. Richardson's aspersions in his chambers upon Sir Robert were well calculated to wean from him by ridicule his fellows.[2] Doubtless, a few subscribed from a genuine dislike of revels, either on grounds of good order or religion; such would have been Sir Ralph Hopton, his aged father Robert, the Puritan John

[1] S.P. 16/255, no. 39. The petition apparently alluded to the serious churchale riot at Coleford on Holy Thursday (30 May) 1633. Eighteen rioters, all from neighbouring villages, were arrested. The area (a mining region on Mendip, given to boisterousness) had been emboldened by Richardson's revocation of the prohibitions at the Dorset assizes two months earlier, and a particularly rowdy churchale ensued. According to testimony, many were hurt, though there had merely been a rumour of someone having been killed, Som.R.O., Sess. rolls, 70, no. 121, informations and examinations before Sir Ralph Hopton, J.P., 20 July 1633. This was the only serious churchale disorder I have been able to find in Somerset between 1625 and 1640. It alone hardly amounted to a 'crime wave'.

[2] According to Phelips, Richardson said: 'I durst not doe this [advance the petition] if Sir Robert Phelips were by . . . Sir Robert Phelips is a fyne gentleman, makes very fyne speeches in the Parliament house, yet Sir Thomas Richardson will notwithstanding be Lord cheife justice still.' Som.R.O., DD/PH, fo. 137 ff.

Harington, and the three or four other older and quietly hard-working justices who held themselves above faction. One who signed, John Symes, was a close friend and constant supporter of Phelips, but also a sincere Puritan. The twenty-four justices then in the commission who did not subscribe (for whom Richardson had some harsh words) are no less interesting. Phelips, Berkeley, and Dr. Godwin did not sign, of course, nor did some half-dozen other loyal partisans of Sir Robert. The rest were the timorous, the 'king's men' by virtue of lucrative office or hope of it (Robert Henley, chief clerk of enrolments in the King's Bench, among them)—in short, those who saw the royal handwriting on the wall and desired to avoid the difficulties which an untenable stand on principle would incur.

Richardson had overstepped himself, and Phelips grasped the opportunity to trip him up. On 18 August he addressed a letter to the king, setting forth the unfit carriage of the chief justice.[1] He concluded with a supplication for personal satisfaction from Richardson, asking that the matter be referred to Bishop Laud and the lord privy seal, the earl of Manchester. On 25 August the matter was referred to Manchester, the earl marshal (the earl of Arundel and Surrey) and the archbishop of Canterbury—Abbot's death three weeks before having allowed Laud's translation to the long-awaited primacy.[2] Richardson was in serious trouble. The king's instructions of 12 November, that the three councillors along with Lord Keeper Coventrye were to examine the chief justice and take information of Phelips and any others who could testify to Richardson's bearing at the assizes, promised Phelips an opportunity to press his adversary with his consummate forensic skill.[3] The new archbishop would have his chance to humiliate the judge who had repeatedly challenged his wishes over churchales. When Richardson returned from circuit he was convented before Laud and the other referees. What occurred at the meeting was cloaked in the Council's customary secrecy, but what Sir Robert Phelips said there in prosecution of the chief justice is known from draft notes of his argument.[4] He handled the prosecution adroitly, attacking Richardson decisively for casting aspersion upon the king's commands, and dwelling at some

[1] *Ibid.*, fo. 131, Phelips to the king, 18 Aug. 1633, endorsed by Windebank with a note of reference.

[2] *Ibid.*, *loc. cit.* [3] *Ibid.*, fo. 133. [4] *Ibid.*, fos. 137 ff.

length on Richardson's insults directed towards his own person. He identified the judge with the 'Preciser sort' by innuendo: '[Richardson] mentioned the puritans in a favourable distinction.' The attack recalled the old fire which over a decade earlier had set the Commons in hot pursuit of Mompesson.

The climax to the churchales controversy came in a plenary meeting of the Council, attended by Charles himself, at which the lord chief justice of England was roundly censured. Laud apparently savoured his victory over Richardson:

> [The chief justice] coming very dejectedly with tears in his eyes out of the Councel Chamber, the Earle of Derset seeing him in such a sad condition, and demaunding him how he did, he answered, "Very ill my Lord for I am like to bee choked with the Archbishops Lawnsleeves." [1]

The chief justice was a broken man; moreover, was a broken judge. He was not dismissed his place of chief justice as Coke and Crew had been earlier when they had fallen afoul of Stuart monarchs. His degradation was more invidious and no less effective, while it did not martyr him for the cause of judicial independence. Henceforth Richardson was to ride the Home (or Essex) Circuit, accounted the meanest, least commodious, and most onerous of the six assize circuits, usually left to the puisnes and serjeants-at-law in commission.[2] He was laid open to all the covert taunts and jeers with which his profession was wont to greet the fall of the mighty. In February 1635 Richardson died, never having recovered in spirit from his humiliation at Laud's hands.

Had the result of the churchales controversy been merely the humiliation of Richardson, it would not have done such harm to the peace of the realm. It was unlikely, however, that one of

[1] Prynne, *Canterburies Doome*, p. 148.

[2] P.R.O., Index 4212 (Crown Office docket book, 1629–1640) under date 23 Feb. 1634, docket of patent permitting Richardson, C.J., to take assizes on the Home Circuit though his seat was there. In 1587, the *per diem* allowance for the judges on the Home Circuit was £5 14s. 0d., or £1 3s. 4d. less than for the Western, and the least for all the circuits save the Northern, which was the same, Brit. Mus., Lansdowne MS. 53, fo. 198. These proportions remained the same. The amount of criminal business at assizes on the Home Circuit was disproportionately heavy because of the density of population in those counties.

Laud's temperament would let pass an opportunity to strike at the 'Preciser sort' whom he had discomfited in the diocese of London and whom he intended as primate to repress throughout England. In October, even before the degradation of Richardson, he had written to Bishop Pierce, and in the king's name commanded him to summon the 'gravest' of his clergy, those best affected to Church and government, and inquire of them how churchales had been ordered during the past year.[1] What Laud sought was justification for a course of action upon which he had already determined—the reissue of King James's Book of Sports.[2] This royal declaration on lawful Sunday sports resulted from a short sojourn by James in Lancashire following his return from Scotland in 1617. While there, he was informed of the long policy of suppression of churchales by the county's justices, which some of his courtiers had intimated was a great grievance to the common folk. His 1617 declaration to the Lancashire justices (allowing revels) was extended with modifications to the whole kingdom in 1618.[3] It was a moderate statement of those sports which were allowable on Sundays after divine service, and a warrant for churchales so long as order was preserved. Laud intended that the Book of Sports, refurbished to give more forceful sanction to churchales, should serve as a precise definition of those Sunday activities acceptable to the duly constituted ecclesiastical authority. Upon this foundation, he could build the structure of uniform practice in such matters throughout the kingdom.

Without waiting for Pierce's reply, Laud moved Charles to reprint with additions the 1618 declaration. Published on 18 October 1633, it was distributed to the diocesans who were to see that it was made known in every parish in the realm. By implication, the ministers who for conscience sake would not obey their ordinaries in publishing the command from the pulpit

[1] S.P. 16/247, no. 24. Pierce replied on 5 Nov. 1633, S.P. 16/250, no. 20. The 72 hand-picked incumbents consulted were enthusiastic in advocacy of revels.

[2] *The Kings Maiesties Declaration to His Subjects concerning lawfull Sports to bee used* (1618). The 1633 reissue, a copy of which is S.P. 16/248, no. 13, is reprinted in full in Gardiner's *Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution 1625–1660* (1906), pp. 99–103.

[3] See *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, xxxii. 561–8, for a note by J. Tait treating the Lancashire affair.

were to be proceeded against in the High Commission. If it was Laud's intention, as Prynne alleged, 'to insnare . . . and root out all conscientious preaching Ministers . . .' then the Book of Sports adequately served his purpose.[1] In the following months, a number of incumbents throughout the realm were censured, suspended from their ministries, and even deprived of their livings for refusal to comply.[2] Sporadic opposition to churchales in Somerset continued, reaching a climax in the outspoken presentment of the grand jury at the Bath assizes, 2 July 1638. Striking out at various impositions, the nineteen intrepid gentlemen complained of the great companies of 'unruly people' gathering at the bull-baitings during bidales. The jury's contention, that such were so public and frequent that the justices of the peace could not help but know of them and yet none were punished, evidenced the extent to which Laud's oppression had quenched the justices' zeal to repress even the disorderly aspects of churchales.[3]

The reissue of the Book of Sports was the first move, and the first successful move, by Laud in his design to impose uniformity of practice throughout the English Church. It demonstrated clearly his intention to withstand the pressure of the 'Humorists' (as he called them). The reissue forced the extremer Puritans into overt opposition, thrusting them up to be pruned from the body spiritual by the ecclesiastical courts. It was responsible for provoking the most large-scale expulsion of the 'Godly' clergy since the enforcement of the 1604 Canons, sending forth the leaders of conventicles who would implant their grievances in the minds of sympathetic laity. It is not just coincidence that the first conventicles detectable in Somerset date from 1635. Quite aside from exacerbating extreme Puritan sensibilities, the Book of Sports advertised the new power bent upon a new design for the Church, and as such was an inauspicious prelude to the archbishop's main campaign for recasting the Church, the metropolitical visitation of 1634. The hostility the visitors encountered

[1] Prynne, *op. cit.*, p. 148.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 149, cites a number of instances of clergy proceeded against. The incumbents of Claverton, Ubley, and Beer Crocombe in Somerset were punished for refusal to comply, and the vicar of Montacute (in the patronage of Sir Robert Phelips) was censured for preaching on a revel day from Joel ii —'Blow ye the trumpet in Zion . . . for the day of the Lord cometh, for it is nigh at hand', *Vict. Co. Hist.*, *Somerset*, ii (1911), p. 44.

[3] S.P. 16/395, no. 9, and /538, no. 57.

might well have owed something to the loss of the element of surprise, Laud having shown his hand with the Book of Sports. To Laud, the reissue was the natural sequel to his triumph in the churchales controversy. To those who feared and hated him, it was an omen of what they considered was his foul scheme to enfeeble the Church and reconcile it with Rome.

While this was the wider significance of the churchales controversy, the impact upon the county of what was in greatest part a political squabble within it, is worthy of mention. The whole affair had a corrosive effect on the common identification of interests between the king and his Council on the one hand and the county's magnates on the other. Tudor-Stuart monarchy depended on the vitality of that identification, for the justices of the peace were the indispensable executors of much of the king's domestic policy. When the king and Council turned their faces against the petition begging for the suppression of churchales, twenty-five Somerset justices were rebuffed in what for some of them was a sincere attempt to appeal to the king's better judgment. They were confounded, and a policy which they and their magisterial fathers before them had upheld was overthrown, not (in their view) upon reasonable grounds. To Poulett and his allies, who opposed the regal will only that they might embarrass their opponents and strengthen their position in the county, the rebuff was a sore blow and one not easily salved. This did not provoke a crisis in the county—crisis connotes a matter too serious for the term to be applied lightly to the contretemps of county politics. It did mean, however, a widening of that divergence between the central government and the local administrators which led ultimately to the breakdown of local government and, consequently, the destruction of Personal Rule even before the Long Parliament convened. Nor did the humiliation of Richardson serve to strengthen the common identification of Westminster's interests with the gentry's. The inexpendable nexus between the two was assizes, presided over by those commanding stewards of royal power, the judges. Phelips's victory over the chief justice—for that was how it appeared to Sir Robert's colleagues—brought the place of judge into contempt. An old parliamentarian like Phelips, who had grappled successfully with the nuances of prerogative and privilege, might aver before privy councillors: 'To his [Richardson's] place all

obedience; submission to his person, not so.'[1] But in fact, place and person were too inextricably bound up in a judge of assize to admit of any subtle separation. Anything which lessened the authority of the judge of assize damaged the whole fabric of government.

Implicit in the churchales controversy is a warning to those who would search in the counties during the Personal Rule for the developments leading to civil war. Apparently, the churchales controversy moved on the plane of religious sentiments and beliefs. In reality, it was mainly a four-way clash of personal rivalries, in which the animosity between Laud and Richardson was grafted onto the county factionalism of Phelips and Poulett. Only with the reissue of the Book of Sports and Laud's enforcement of it did the religious issue emerge. Had it appeared in the first place as the efficient cause of the controversy, it would have loomed even larger, indicating deeper roots for extreme Puritanism in Somerset than did exist. Though there can be no denying the importance of the religious issue in advancing the breach within the Church, yet the destructive force of the local factionalism which dominated the controversy, if multiplied by all the counties of the kingdom, might have been as injurious to the peace as were religious differences. Local factionalism fed upon constitutional and religious issues, not because of the factions' sentiment for one position or the other, but because these great concerns could be used to belabour one's opponent, as Phelips so ably demonstrated in the churchales controversy. In employing this ready weapon, the factions centred attention on the issues involved and identified them with powerful leaders in the society of the county. By forcing the rival side to take the opposite position, the factions provided apparently clear-cut stands on principle for their politically conscious neighbours to assume. In making the issues of the period both more notorious and simpler, local factionalism contributed to the merging of political and religious opposition to royal policy. On the basis of one incident, it would be presumptuous to do more than suggest that the amalgam of constitutional and religious issues created during the Personal Rule was fused in the crucible of petty local rivalries. None the less, this approach is worth considering.

[1] Som.R.O., DD/PH, fos. 137 ff.

COMMERCE IN THE DARK AGES: A CRITIQUE OF THE EVIDENCE

By Philip Grierson, M.A., F.R.Hist.S.

READ 10 OCTOBER 1958

I

WHEN Pirenne contributed an article entitled 'Mahomet et Charlemagne' to the first issue of the *Revue Belge de Philologie et d'Histoire* in 1922,[1] he can have little realized how the ideas he there put forward were to be developed. His paper was designed as a protest against the traditional and deep-rooted conviction of western scholars that Latin Christendom was the direct and almost the sole heir of classical antiquity. Its argument was the now familiar one that Greco-Roman society survived with little change the shock of the Germanic invasions, and that it was only the appearance of Islam upon the scene that pushed the centre of Latin Christendom away from the Mediterranean and made possible the emergence of a new cultural unit based upon the land mass of western Europe. Medieval Christendom was not a continuation of the Roman world but something new, and Muhammed was a necessary precursor of Charlemagne.

In his first formulation of this point of view, Pirenne was not particularly concerned with economic issues, but he did argue that even after the invasions the west remained under the economic dominance of the east. Jewish and Syrian merchants continued to provide it with luxury goods, and it was through their intermediacy that it received the papyrus used in its chancelleries and the gold necessary for its coinage. Economic emancipation did not occur till the end of the Merovingian period, and when it did occur, it was almost synonymous with economic collapse.

Such opinions were not likely to pass unchallenged, and as discussion of Pirenne's views developed, economic and social considerations came more and more to the fore. Statistical evidence could not be hoped for: for the centuries in question there was a total absence of commercial documents, of customs and taxation

[1] *RBPH*, i (1922), 77–86.

records, of gild regulations, of detailed trade agreements, of the innumerable sources from which we can piece together something like a credible picture of the nature, direction and volume of commerce during the last four centuries of the Middle Ages. The west provided one with nothing comparable even to such Byzantine sources as the *Book of the Prefect* or the *Rhodian Sea Law*, unless the *Capitulare de Villis* could be regarded as coming into such a category. In the absence of quantitative evidence, such scraps of qualitative evidence as were available had to do. Chronicles, ecclesiastical biographies, *Miracula* and *Translationes* of relics, royal and episcopal correspondence, monastic privileges and concessions, Carolingian capitularies and Anglo-Saxon law codes were ransacked for references to traders and trade. Archaeology and in particular numismatics were brought in to help, since they provided much information on the distribution of coin and of certain other types of manufactured articles. The net result by now, thirty-five years after the opening of the great debate, is the very widespread impression that Pirenne and his critics were almost equally wrong. Commerce in the Dark Ages was much more considerable in volume than has been generally allowed, even if less highly organized than it was to be in later centuries.[1]

This view I believe to be largely incorrect. It results in the main from the failure to distinguish between three different types of evidence: (i) evidence of the existence of traders, *i.e.* of persons making their living by commerce; (ii) evidence of trade, in the narrow sense of the sale of specialized or surplus goods directly by producer to consumer without the intervention of any third party; and (iii) evidence for the distribution by unspecified means of goods, particularly luxury goods, and money. The confusion between the first two categories is not perhaps very important,

[1] It is not possible here to attempt a bibliography. Pirenne's own views were embodied in his posthumously published *Mahomet et Charlemagne* (Paris–Brussels, 1937). Two valuable critical studies, concentrating on certain aspects and including much bibliographical material, are R. S. Lopez, 'Mohammed and Charlemagne: a revision', *Speculum*, xviii (1943), 14–38, and D. C. Dennett, 'Pirenne and Muhammad', *ibid.*, xxiii (1948), 165–90. A résumé of the views of Alfons Dopsch will be found in his *Naturalwirtschaft und Geldwirtschaft in die Weltgeschichte* (Vienna, 1930), pp. 110 *seq.* Many works on specific topics are referred to below. The most recent general survey is R. Latouche, *Les Origines de l'économie occidentale* (Paris, 1956).

but that between trade and distribution, and still more the habit of treating evidence for the distribution of luxury goods and coin as if it were nothing more than supplementary evidence of the existence and activity of traders, is of a serious character. It involves the error of reading history backwards—or in this case also forwards: of assuming that because material goods were later, as they had been in Roman times, distributed largely by the agency of trade, the same was necessarily the case in the Dark Ages. Even the briefest reflection must show that this is scarcely likely to have been the case. The whole approach, that of accumulating evidence for the existence of trade instead of trying to form an overall picture of how and to what extent material goods changed ownership, is in itself profoundly misleading and can only result in conclusions that are far from the truth.

II

The confusion between 'traders' and 'trade' need not delay us for long. *Mercator* and *negotiator* were elastic terms. They could cover a *quidam pauperculus* hawking a mule-load of salt between Paris and Orléans, or two petty traders in the Saturday market at Fleury quarrelling over a shilling,[1] just as effectively as rich Syrian or Jewish traders who dealt in slaves and spices or wealthy merchants at Mainz who bought corn in the upper Main valley and sold it in the Rhineland. The merchants of Verdun who are found specializing in the slave trade in the ninth and tenth centuries, shipping their unhappy merchandise from eastern Europe or Britain as far afield as Spain and Constantinople, may well have vied in wealth with some of their counterparts in the Islamic or Byzantine worlds. Merchants of these various types, ranging from pedlars to rich traders but alike in the fact that commerce was their profession and means of livelihood, existed throughout the Dark Ages. Only their numbers and character, and to some extent the regions in which they operated, altered with the passage of time.

The *mercatores* dealt mainly, though not exclusively, in goods that were to some degree luxuries; only exceptionally did they deal in corn or clothing. The ordinary surplus of a great estate, the eggs

[1] *Cf.* E. Sabbe, 'Quelques types de marchands des IXe et Xe siècles', *RBPH*, xiii (1934), 176–87.

and chickens and the fish from the fish ponds which the lord's household did not need and which the steward in the *Capitulare de Villis*[1] is told to use his discretion over selling, would go to the local market; only when an estate was of a specialized character, possessing vineyards or salt deposits or minerals, were professional *mercatores* likely to be interested in its produce. The development of this local buying and selling can probably be related to the transition from gold to silver as a medium of exchange in the last quarter of the seventh century. The spread of a silver coinage in regions where no coin had previously circulated—Mercia and Wessex in the ninth century, Germany and east central Europe in the tenth—is intimately connected with its further extension.

The development of markets—and grants of *moneta* are closely associated with those of *mercatum publicum* and *teloneum*—is one of the most noticeable features of the economic history of the ninth and tenth centuries, but while recognizing the importance of the mutual buying and selling of surplus farm produce or peasant handicrafts, we must be careful to distinguish its economic consequences from those of the activities of the *mercatores*. Such exchanges might in varying degrees raise the standard of life of those participating in them, but they would only rarely serve as a stimulus to increasing output and to saving and investment. It is here that the activities of the *mercatores* left their mark: they injected the element of a profit motive into a society so organized as to exclude it from many aspects of its daily life. Mr. Southern has with characteristic felicity described the far-reaching consequences of 'the taste for spices and the charm of luxuries':

> it was to satisfy this taste that merchants travelled, sailors perished, bankers created credit and peasants raised the numbers of their sheep. As so often happens, the secondary effects are more interesting than the primary ones: . . . the activities and organization which existed to satisfy the demands of the relatively few coloured the whole history of the Middle Ages, and are the foundations of modern commerce and industry.[2]

One of my colleagues, a specialist on the economy of under-

[1] *Capitulare de Villis*, cc. 39, 65 (in *Capitularia regum Francorum*, ed. A. Boretius, i (Hanover, 1883), pp. 86, 89).

[2] R. W. Southern, *The making of the Middle Ages* (London, 1953), p. 42.

developed counties, has commented to me on the insight displayed in this passage, since in regions as far apart as west Africa and Malaya he had again and again seen the same process at work at the present day.

In dealing with the economic life of the Dark Ages, therefore, there are good reasons for keeping these two types of trade separate from one another. The undoubted importance of the Vikings in the economic development of Europe[1] has often been attributed to their interest in trade and supported by somewhat unconvincing parallels between their activities and those of Elizabethan buccaneers in whose enterprises no hard and fast line between piracy and commerce can be drawn. The situation of the two was in fact very different. The background in the one case was a society with a money economy in which the profit motive, if not dominant, played at least a leading role; in the other it was a society in which coined money did not even exist and money and the concept of mercantile profit were alike in an embryonic stage. The reputation of the Vikings as traders depends very largely on archaeological evidence, which is ambiguous, or on the misinterpretation of such texts as that which describes their first landing at Dorchester, when they were taken for peaceful merchants instead of pirates.[2] It is true that Franks had to be prohibited from selling them arms and horses[3] and that Danegeld

[1] See particularly A. Bugge, 'Die nordeuropäischen Verkehrswege im frühen Mittelalter und die Bedeutung der Wikinger für die Entwickelung des europäischen Handels und der europäischen Schiffahrt', *Vierteljahrschrift f. Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte*, iv (1906), 227–77; P. Kletler, *Nordwesteuropas Verkehr, Handel und Gewerbe im frühen Mittelalter* (Vienna, 1924); H. Arbman, *Schweden und das karolingische Reich. Studien zu den Handelverbindungen der 9. Jahrhunderts* (Stockholm, 1937); and the work of Jankuhn referred to below, p. 136, n. For a very sceptical approach, see F. J. Himly, 'Y a-t-il emprise musulmane sur l'économie des états européens du VIIIe au Xe siècle?', *Revue suisse d'histoire*, v (1955), 35–48.

[2] Aethelweard, *Chronicon*, iii. 1 (in H. Petrie, *Monumenta Historica Britannica*, i (1848), p. 509). The king's reeve ordered them to come to Dorchester, *putans eos magis negotiatores esse quam hostes*. The text does not imply that he believed them to be *Scandinavian* traders, and the terms of Alcuin's letter to King Aethelred on the sack of Lindisfarne, in which he expresses his amazement that Scandinavians should have made such a voyage (*nec eiusmodi navigium fieri posse putabatur*), sufficiently shows that they cannot have been regarded as such (*Mon. Germ. Hist., Epist. Karolini Aevi*, ii. 42).

[3] *Edictum Pistense*, c. 25 (*in Capitularia*, ii. 321).

sometimes included a demand for wine as well as gold and silver,[1] but these objects were obviously required for use, not for sale. This was trade, if you like, but it scarcely proves that the Vikings were traders. Their importance in the history of European commerce resulted, it seems to me, from quite different considerations: by their accumulation of treasure they naturally encouraged enterprising merchants to attempt to relieve them of it by offering them goods in exchange. These hopes were sometimes disappointed, as in the case of the luckless merchants who made their way into Asselt in 882 hoping to trade with the victors and were massacred for their pains.[2] Even in the case of such acknowledged trading centres as Hedeby and Birka we do not know how far the 'trade' was in Viking hands or how far their influence extended.

Furthermore, in recognizing the existence of traders and of trade, we must also remember that purchase was not the 'natural' way in which a household in the Dark Ages strove to satisfy its needs. Its ambition was to become as self-sufficient as possible. Lesser households could not hope to match the range of produce envisaged in the *Capitulare de Villis*, but the desire to do so was a universal one. The efforts made by monasteries to acquire 'propriétés excentriques' which would supply them with wine or salt or wax was not characteristic of the Carolingian era and a contracting economy, as Van Werveke argued;[3] it was natural and reasonable in itself and examples of it can be found in any of the centuries for which a reasonable documentation exists.[4] Buying was only resorted to when all else failed. Einhard might resign himself to paying £50 for the lead required to cover the roof of

[1] *E.g. Annales Bertiniani*, a. 866 (ed. G. Waitz, Hanover, 1883, p. 81).

[2] *Annales Fuldenses*, a. 882 (ed. F. Kurze, Hanover, 1891, pp. 98–99). Kurze's identification of *Ascloha* with Elsloo is incorrect.

[3] H. Van Werveke, 'Comment les établissements religieux belges se procuraient-ils du vin au haut moyen âge', *RBPH*, ii (1923), 643–62; 'Les propriétés excentriques des églises au haut moyen-âge', *ibid.*, iv (1925), 136–41.

[4] Van Werveke's views were criticized by Dennett, *op. cit.* (above, p. 124, n. 1), pp. 188–9, who points out that the grants of vineyards cited date from anywhere between 650 and 1180. He himself regards it as a form of investment. It seems to me that Van Werveke is correct in treating it as an urge towards greater self-sufficiency, since the grouping together of estates with products complementary to one another is found elsewhere, but that difficulties over purchasing the commodities had nothing to do with it.

his church at Seligenstadt,[1] but Servatus Lupus preferred to write directly to the king of Wessex and a court official named Felix and beg for the metal he wanted as a gift. Merchants would thus be excluded from the transaction; the lead would be paid for not in material wealth but in the promise of prayers, and the abbot arranged to send his serfs to the mouth of the Canche to collect the lead and bring it by barge to the abbey.[2] Similarly, when Pope Adrian I was promised a thousand pounds of lead for the repair of the roof of St. Peter's, he requested Charlemagne to have it sent in hundred-pound packages in the baggage of court officials who happened to be visiting Rome, instead of arranging its transport by the care of traders.[3] In both these transactions we are in the presence not of commerce but of a form of gift-exchange to which we will return in a moment.

III

Distortion of the picture arises less from the confusion of traders with trade than from the assumption that goods and money necessarily passed from one hand to another only by means of trade. Here we come up squarely against the archaeological evidence, which in its very nature substitutes inference for explanation. It has been said that the spade cannot lie, but it owes this merit in part to the fact that it cannot speak. There is of course some written evidence, such as references to silks, spices, ivories and similar objects in the inventories of monastic possessions or in the correspondence of the time. But the evidence is mainly archaeological: the finding of Byzantine coins and silver plate in such hoards as Pereshschepino and Sutton Hoo, of 'Coptic' bronze bowls and Frankish brooches in England, of Islamic silver coins in gigantic quantities in eastern Europe and Scandinavia. The importance of this type of evidence has grown enormously in recent years, since archaeological advances in the last half-century now enable us to speak with greater assurance than was previously possible on the dates and places of origin of

[1] *Epistolae*, no. 36 (*Epist. Karolini aevi*, iii. 128). See H. Van Werveke, 'Note sur le commerce du plomb au moyen âge', in *Mélanges d'histoire offerts à Henri Pirenne* (Brussels, 1926), pp. 653–62.

[2] Loup de Ferrières, *Correspondance*, ed. L. Levillain, ii (Paris, 1935), 70–74. *Cf.* also below, p. 139, n. 3.

[3] *Codex Carolinus*, no. 78 (*Epist. Karol. aevi*, i. 670).

many of the objects that have been found. Almost all scholars who have written about them have assumed that they reached their destination through the medium of trade. This is particularly true of numismatists, whose approach to the whole subject is sometimes one of singular naïvety. Walter Hävernick, perhaps the most distinguished living German numismatist, virtually assumes that even coins of an exceptional character, like the gold solidi of Louis the Pious, were produced for commercial reasons and that since they were distributed in the normal course of trade it is possible to draw valid conclusions regarding trade routes from studying the localities in which they have been found.[1] One of the best of English numismatists can write, of a silver coin of Athalaric found at Brighton, that 'this piece can have journeyed hither only by the slow process of trade. In this way it might have taken upwards of a century to reach Britain' [2]—and this despite the fact that the coin was quite fresh and in good condition when it was found. The most recent work on the economic life of the Dark Ages, Professor A. R. Lewis's *The Northern Seas*,[3] takes it for granted that trade, and trade alone, was responsible for the distribution of goods and coins in the centuries with which he deals.[4]

IV

Such a view is altogether too narrow, and prejudges too many issues. There are other means whereby goods can pass from hand

[1] 'Die Anfänge der karolingische Goldprägung in Nordwesteuropa', *Hamburger Beiträge zur Numismatik*, ii/vi (1954), 55–60.

[2] C. H. V. Sutherland, 'Post-Roman coins found at Brighton', *Numismatic Chronicle*, 6th ser., i (1941), 87.

[3] Princeton, 1958. This book is frequently unreliable over details, quite apart from the deductions based upon them: *e.g.* on pp. 208 and 305 the Delgany hoard is cited as having contained Frankish coins and consequently providing evidence of commercial relations between Ireland and Gaul. Not only is its commercial character unproven and unlikely—Evans, who described the hoard, believed that it came from a Viking raid on Kent—but it contained no Frankish coins at all.

[4] The titles of many books on the subject testify to the interpretation placed upon the evidence by their authors. *Cf.* C. A. Nordman, 'Schatzfunde und Handelsverbindungen in Finnlands Wikingerzeit', *Acta Archaeologica*, xiii (1942), 272–93; H. L. Adelson, *Light weight solidi and Byzantine trade during the sixth and seventh centuries* (American Numismatic Society, Notes and Monographs, No. 138. New York, 1957).

to hand, means which must have played a more conspicuous part in the society of the Dark Ages than they would in more settled and advanced periods. They can be characterized most briefly as 'theft' and 'gift', using 'theft' to include all unilateral transfers of property which take place involuntarily—plunder in war would be the commonest type—and 'gift' to cover all those which take place with the free consent of the donor. Somewhere between the two would be a varied series of payments, such as ransoms, compensations, and fines, while such payments as dowries, the wages of mercenaries, property carried to and fro by political exiles, would all form part of the picture. Our difficulty lies in trying to estimate their relative importance.

We need not linger long over the category of 'theft'. Life in the early middle ages was insecure in the extreme, and plundering raids, highway robbery and theft in the narrow sense were everywhere of frequent occurrence. There is a curious clause in the laws of Ine of Wessex which seeks to define the various types of forcible attack to which a householder and his property might be subjected: if less than seven men are involved, they are thieves; if between seven and thirty-five, they form a gang; if above thirty-five, they are a military expedition.[1] Such phrases as *cum predam* or *captis thesauris* form a regular accompaniment to the accounts of wars in Gregory of Tours and Fredegarius. Plunder and robbery must be accounted factors of major importance in the distribution of valuables in the Dark Ages, and would sometimes be effective over a considerable area. Gifts from the plundered Avar treasure were sent to English kings and bishops as well as to favoured recipients throughout the Frankish kingdom,[2] and much of the plate and many of the silks and oriental embroideries which occur in ninth-century ecclesiastical inventories had probably passed through Avar hands.

Almost equally important, and in their total bulk far overshadowing transfers of bullion for commercial purposes, were payments of a purely political character. These might be war indemnities, annual tributes, *ex gratia* payments intended to keep

[1] Cap. 12, § 1.

[2] *Cf. Annales regni Francorum*, a. 796 (ed. F. Kurze, Hanover, 1895, p. 98); Alcuin, *Epist.*, no. 100 (*Epist. Karol. aevi*, ii. 146). Offa received a sword-belt, a *gladium Huniscum* and two *pallia sirica*.

a potentially troublesome neighbour in a good humour, or the purchase of services under specific circumstances and on carefully defined conditions. The distribution of gold, in particular, must have been largely influenced by the political payments which bulk so large in the history of Byzantine foreign relations from the fifth century onwards. Theodosius II, for example, was compelled in *c.* 430 to promise an annual tribute of 350 lbs. of gold a year to the Huns, a figure which was doubled in 435 and sextupled—with a lump payment of 6000 lbs.—in 443, the consequent payment of 2,100 lbs. a year continuing down to the accession of Marcian.[1] His successors were only to a slight degree more fortunate, and if Germans and Avars were normally less well placed to bring pressure on the empire than the Huns had been, the tradition of tribute continued throughout the sixth and well into the seventh century. We find Maurice paying 50,000 solidi to Childebert II in the hopes of enlisting his aid against the Lombards,[2] while the exarch of Ravenna had to buy off the attacks of the latter by an annual tribute of 300 lbs. of gold.[3] Similar payments, sometimes in one direction and sometimes in the other, played a major part in Byzantine–Arab relations, and the huge sums involved in such transactions—the 6000 lbs. of gold paid to the Huns in 443 would have amounted to nearly half a million solidi—must have largely determined the distribution of bullion between the Byzantine empire and its neighbours.

Political payments of a similar character were also effective within the barbarian world itself. Witigis paid the Franks 2000 lbs. of gold in the hope of securing their neutrality in the Gothic war.[4] At one moment, in the late sixth century, the Lombards were paying the Franks an annual tribute of 12,000 gold solidi.[5] It was probably a Beneventan tribute paid in gold

[1] E. A. Thompson, *A History of Attila and the Huns* (Oxford, 1948), p. 161.

[2] Gregory of Tours, *Historia Francorum*, vi. 42 (*Script. rer. Merov.*, i. 282).

[3] Fredegarius, iv. 69 (*Script. rer. Merov.*, ii. 155).

[4] Procopius, *De bello Gothico*, i. 13. 14, 27 (Loeb edn., vol. iii. 136, 140). The Byzantines had earlier tried to buy Frankish support (*ibid.*, i. 5.10; vol. iii. 44).

[5] Fredegarius, iv. 45 (pp. 143–4). Fredegarius mentions the bribing of three Frankish nobles with 1,000 solidi apiece.

that made possible the scanty gold coinage of Louis the Pious.[1] The payments of Danegeld by the Franks and Anglo-Saxons were at a later time responsible for the transfer of comparable sums in silver from one part of western Europe to another. Works of art, as well as coin or metal in ingot form, sometimes passed to and fro in a similar fashion. It is notorious that many of the surviving gold medallions of the later empire have been found in Germanic territory and probably reached it by way of gift,[2] like the gold medallions of Tiberius II which Chilperic I showed with pride to Gregory of Tours.[3] When the Visigothic king Sisenand revolted against Swinthila and asked help from Dagobert, he promised in return an immense gold *missorium*, part of the royal treasure of the Goths, which weighed 500 lbs. and had been given by Aetius to King Thorismund two hundred years before. In the end, the Gothic nobles vetoed its alienation, and Dagobert had to content himself with 200,000 gold solidi instead.[4]

Two further facets of diplomatic intercourse, the exchange of gifts between rulers and the expenses of embassies, must not be overlooked. The interchange of gifts can be regarded as a survival of gift-exchange, and will be referred to later. The payment of the expenses of envoys was an extension of the custom of hospitality, but served the not unimportant functions of gratifying and impressing potentially friendly individuals and allowing suspicious governments to exercise some control over their activities. The sums involved were often enormous. Procopius estimated the total lavished by Justinian on a Persian ambassador, including his expenses within the empire and what he was able to take home with him, at 1000 lbs. of gold,[5] and Constantine Porphyrogenitus

[1] P. Grierson, 'The gold solidus of Louis the Pious and its imitations', *Jaarboek voor Munt- en Penningkunde*, xxxviii (1951), 3–5.

[2] *Cf.* E. Babelon, 'La trouvaille de Helleville (Manche) en 1780', *Revue numismatique*, 4th ser., x (1906), 185–9.

[3] *Hist. Franc.*, vi. 2 (pp. 245–6).

[4] Fredegarius, iv. 73 (pp. 157–8). The last figure must be an exaggeration, for the bullion value of a gold object weighing 500 lbs. would only come to 36,000 solidi.

[5] Procopius, *De bell. Pers.*, ii. 28.44 (Loeb edn., i. 526). We know from Constantine Porphyrogenitus, *De ceremoniis*, i. 89–90 (Bonn edn., i. 398–410), that foreign envoys were regarded as imperial guests from the moment that they crossed the frontier and not merely while they were in Constantinople. This is also apparent from Liutprand of Cremona's account of his embassies.

gives the precise reckoning of the payments in silver, amounting to over a million *miliaresia*, which were made to the Russian princess Olga on the occasion of her visit to Constantinople in 957.[1] A substantial proportion of these sums would no doubt be recovered in the form of gratuities before the envoys departed, but much of it would normally leave the empire in the form of either bullion or luxury goods.[2] In the case of Olga's embassy, the *miliaresia* brought back to Russia must have exceeded the total number of Byzantine silver coins found in that country many times over.

Sums paid in ransoming captives formed likewise an element of great importance in the life of the early Middle Ages. A successful raid into the Byzantine empire would be followed by complex negotiations regarding the fate of those who had been carried off, while towns and cities might have to buy immunity during the actual campaign. Enormous sums of money might change hands in this way. Procopius has recorded the levies of Chosroes on the cities of Syria during the Persian wars of Justinian: 2000 lbs. of silver on Hierapolis and Beroea, 1000 lbs. of gold on Antioch, 1000 lbs. of silver on Apamea, 200 lbs. of gold on Chalcis, 200 lbs. of gold and later a further 500 lbs. on Edessa.[3] Such huge figures were no doubt exceptional, and it is probable that in the relations between Byzantium and the west, and within Latin Christendom itself, personal ransoms were as a whole of rather greater significance. A solidus per head was the common reckoning at Constantinople, though it might be higher or lower on occasion: when Maurice broke off negotiations with the khagan of the Avars for the ransom of over 12,000 captured soldiers, they were priced at

[1] *De ceremoniis*, ii. 15 (Bonn edn., i. 594–8). *Cf.* also the gifts to Saracen ambassadors detailed in the preceding section, *e.g.* on pp. 584, 592. The *miliaresion* was probably reckoned 24 to the nomisma at this period.

[2] *Cf.* the purchase of cloaks by Liutprand of Cremona on his embassies to Constantinople and his consequent difficulties with customs officials (*De legatione*, cc. 53–55; *Opera*, ed. J. Becker (3rd edn., Hanover, 1915), pp. 203–6).

[3] Procopius, *De bello Pers.*, ii. 6.24; 7.5–8; 8.4; 11.3, 24; 12.2, 34; 27.46 (Loeb edn., i. 312, 314, 325, 352, 356, 362, 372, 514). The 1000 lbs. of gold at Antioch was not actually paid, and the city was captured and sacked instead, while at Edessa, when Chosroes believed himself on the point of capturing the city, he had demanded that it should hand over either 50,000 lbs. of gold or all the gold and silver it contained (*ibid.*, ii. 26.39; p. 498).

only 4 *keratia*—a sixth of a solidus—apiece.[1] Individuals of any importance were naturally worth a great deal more. When Isaac Comnenus, duke of Antioch and brother of the future emperor Alexius, was captured by the Seljuqs in the reign of Michael VII, a sum of 20,000 nomismata had to be paid for his release,[2] and the ransom of Romanus IV after the battle of Manzikert was reputed to be a million or even a million and a half nomismata. At Byzantium, amid a mass of legislation forbidding the alienation of church property, an exception is always made *causa redemptionis captivorum*; *cum non absurdum est*, in the words of the Code of Justinian, *animas hominum quibuscumque causis vel vestimentis praeferri*.[3] Probably many of the articles of silverware which left the empire in the sixth and seventh centuries did so for the ransom of prisoners; one remembers that a silver dish in the Pereshchepino hoard had previously belonged to a bishop of Tomi,[4] and Priscus tells us how a far-sighted bishop of Sirmium set aside the sacred vessels of his church to ransom him in the event of his capture during the campaigns of Attila.[5]

The payment of mercenaries must also not be forgotten. In the later Roman period we hear mainly of the services rendered by neighbouring tribes, or on occasion by the Huns, to such leaders as Stilicho and Aetius, but we are ignorant of the precise figures for which they were hired. Individuals—adventurers or exiles—may have come from even further afield; it is reasonable to conjecture that the gold coins of the fifth and early sixth centuries which have been found in considerable numbers in the Baltic region reached there as payment to mercenaries instead of by trade, as they are frequently assumed to have done.[6] One of the

[1] Cedrenus, *Historia*, a. 19 Mauricii (Bonn edn., i. 700). His totals do not agree with one another, and it is clear that the number of prisoners was above 12,000, but it is not apparent how the two demonstrable errors in his text should be corrected.

[2] Nicephorus Bryennius, *Commentarii*, ii. 29 (Bonn edn., p. 99).

[3] *Cod. Just.*, 1.2.21. *Cf. Nov. Just.*, 7.8; 65.1; 120.10.

[4] L. Matzulewitsch, *Byzantinische Antike* (Berlin, 1929), no. 6, pp. 101 *seq.*

[5] Priscus, *Excerpta de legationibus* (Bonn edn., pp. 186–7).

[6] This particular point has been much discussed. T. J. Arne was firmly of the opinion that the coins left the empire as payment for mercenaries ('Solidusfynden på Öland och Gotland', *Fornvännen*, xiv (1919), 107–111; 'Deux nouvelles découvertes de solidi en Gotland', *Acta Archaeologica*, ii (1931), 1–28), a view supported by J. Werner for the Öland but not for the Gotland series ('Zu den auf Öland und Gotland gefundenen byzantinischen

clearest examples of such payments to mercenaries dates from the mid-eleventh century. In the late 1040's there was a sudden spread of Byzantine types in Danish coinage, which up to then had been mainly English in inspiration. It was quite short-lived, starting under Sven Estrithsson (1047–75) during the civil war between him and his predecessor Magnus (1042–47) and ending under St. Cnut (1080–86). But it was intense while it lasted: almost half of the 77 monetary types attributed to Sven Estrithsson are of recognizably Byzantine origin. The explanation is not a sudden expansion of Byzantine trade with Scandinavia, but the return of Harold Hardrada from Constantinople in 1046 with an immense treasure which, if a gloss in Adam of Bremen can be believed, twelve men could scarcely lift.[1] Its dissemination during the twenty years between his return and his death at Stamfordbridge provided the models for this whole remarkable series of coins.[2]

The compensations and fines of Germanic law would normally result in dissemination of wealth only within relatively restricted areas, but there would be exceptions, as for example when the men of Kent paid 'thirty thousands' to Ine of Wessex in compensation for the death of Mul and his companions or when Theodore of Tarsus induced Aethelbald of Mercia to pay compensation to Ecgfrid of Northumbria after the death of the latter's brother at the battle of the Trent.[3] Dowries might be important: a Frankish princess took with her fifty waggon-loads of treasure in gold, silver and other valuables when she set out to marry Reccared of Spain.[4] The constant movement of exiles to and fro

Goldmünzen', *Fornvännen*, xliv (1949), 257–86). A non-commercial origin seems to me indicated by the uncirculated condition of many of the coins and by the dating of the hoards, notably by the coincidence between the fall of the Ostrogothic kingdom and the ending of the Gotland series in the 550's. H. Jankuhn in his capital study 'Der fränkisch-friesische Handel zur Ostsee im frühen Mittelalter' (*Vierteljahrschrift f. Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte*, xl (1953), 193–243) regards them as commercial imports.

[1] *Gesta Hammaburgensis ecclesiae pontificum*, iii. 51, Schol. 84 (*Mon. Germ. Hist., Script.*, vii. 356). The scribe believed that Harold still had at least the bulk of it in his possession at the time of his death, and that it fell to William the Conqueror, which is certainly incorrect.

[2] *Cf.* P. Hauberg, 'De l'influence byzantine sur les monnaies de Danemark au XIe siècle', *Congrès international de numismatique* (Paris, 1900), pp. 335–45.

[3] *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* (Parker MS.), a. 694; Bede, *Hist. eccles.*, iv. 19.

[4] Gregory of Tours, *Hist. Franc.*, vi. 45 (p. 284).

must also not be forgotten. Lombard exiles in Bavaria, Frankish exiles in Ireland, Northumbrian exiles at the court of Charlemagne would rarely be entirely penniless, and the feuds of the Germanic world must have frequently contributed to the transfer of jewellery and personal valuables from one country to another.

Last but not least, though perhaps the most likely to be overlooked, is the survival in early medieval society of the phenomenon known to anthropologists as gift-exchange.[1] The custom of present-giving is only vestigial in modern society, confined to such occasions as Christmas and Easter and to birthdays and other anniversaries, but in earlier times it was a major form of social activity, serving a function analogous to that of commerce in securing the distribution of goods and services. Such gifts would not be one-sided, for social custom required that every gift had to be compensated sooner or later by a counter-gift, or by equivalent services if persons of different social status were involved. This mutual exchange of gifts at first sight resembles commerce, but its objects and ethos are entirely different. Its object is not that of material and tangible 'profit', derived from the difference between the value of what one parts with and what one receives in exchange; rather it is the social prestige attached to generosity, to one's ability and readiness to lavish one's wealth on one's neighbours and dependents. The 'profit' consists in placing other people morally in one's debt, for a counter-gift—or services in lieu of one—is necessary if the recipient is to retain his self-respect. From this point of view, indeed, the relationship between the Church and its benefactors can be regarded as involving no more than a particular form of gift-exchange, the counter-gift taking the form of prayers for the souls of the donor and his family.

The practice of gift-giving is naturally most strongly found in the period of the invasions and the barbarian kingdoms, where society had altered less from its primitive Germanic pattern. Tacitus had long before recorded the peculiar pleasure which Germanic chieftains took in the receiving of presents from neighbouring states, such objects as fine horses and armour, or metal discs and collars,[2] and there is a striking passage in Beowulf in

[1] The classic study is M. Mauss, *Essai sur le don* (1935; Eng. transl. by I. Cunnison, *The Gift; forms and functions of exchange in archaic societies*, 1954).

[2] *Germania*, c. 15, *ad fin.*

which Hrothgar bids farewell to the hero, praising him for the peace he has brought about between the Danes and the Geats, so that in the future gift and counter-gift can be freely exchanged between the two peoples:

> There shall be, while I rule this spacious kingdom,
> Interchange of treasure: many with good things
> Shall greet one another across the gannet's bath;
> And over the deep the ringed ship shall carry
> Gifts and love-tokens.[1]

Again and again, in Anglo-Saxon literature and in northern sagas, the giving of gifts and the generosity of a ruler is singled out for the highest praise. In the preface to Wulfsige's copy of the Old English translation of Gregory's *Dialogues* the bishop describes Alfred as 'the best ring-giver' he has ever heard of amongst earthly kings,[2] and in such poems as the *Battle of Maldon* the relationship of mutual obligation created by gift-giving is one to which appeal is made again and again. Meanness vies with cowardice as the most shameful of human defects; the miserliness of the Scylding Prince Hrethric, son of the generous Hrothgar, earns him the nickname Hnauggvanbaugi, 'the niggard with rings', in the Old Norse royal list (*Langfeðgatal*).[3] The wealth amassed with insatiable cupidity by Merovingian kings[4] was not intended to defray the expenses of an elaborate system of government, as was the heavy taxation of Roman times, but was designed to maintain the social prestige of the kings by being lavished on their followers.

[1] Ll. 1859–63. The translation is that of D. H. Crawford.

[2] H. Hecht, *Bischofs Waerferth von Worcester Übersetzung der Dialoge Gregors des Grossen*, i (Leipzig, 1900), 2. On the identity of the bishop—Wulfsige, not Wulfstan, as it stands in the text—see K. Sisam, *Studies in the history of Old English literature* (Oxford, 1953), pp. 201–2, 225–31. Gold rings were the chief form in which wealth was displayed in the early Germanic period, hence the general use of the word for 'riches'.

[3] Ed. J. Langebek, *Scriptores rerum Danicarum*, i (Copenhagen, 1772), 5, cited in Dorothy Whitelock, *The Audience of Beowulf* (Oxford, 1951), p. 36, n. 4.

[4] *Cf.* R. Doehaerd, 'La richesse des Mérovingiens', in *Studi in onore di Gino Luzzatto* (Milan, 1949), i. 30–46. The urge to accumulate treasure was common to all Germanic rulers. Amalasuntha's treasure, sent for safety to Epidamnus, was reputed to include 40,000 lbs. of gold, the equivalent of nearly three million solidi (Procopius, *De bello Goth.*, 2. 26–28: Loeb edn., iii. 22).

The custom of gift-giving survived the heroic age, and the correspondence of such men as St. Boniface and Alcuin, as later of Einhard and Servatus Lupus, is full of the passage of gifts to and fro. Often these are objects which would be produced in the household of the donor, or in his monastery if he happened to be an abbot, but they might be luxuries or manufactured goods of some special type. Spices being both valuable and easy to transport were in constant demand, and a number of Boniface's correspondents at Rome accompanied their letters with such gifts. These are constantly referred to in the letters which accompanied them as being of a most trifling character—'small indeed, but given out of heartfelt affection'—but such depreciatory terms should not delude us into believing their values were as slight as the donors pretended. The hawk, two falcons, two shields and two spears which Boniface sent to King Aethelbald of Mercia[1] cannot really have merited the description of them as 'those trifling gifts' (*munuscula*), and the presents of spices must always have been costly. No doubt they represent a development in the direction of the modern custom of gift-giving, where the gifts are of the nature of tokens, but they have not yet reached that point. Nor were men reluctant to ask for what they wanted, however curious or unusual their demands might be. When King Aethelbert of Kent sent Boniface a silver gilt cup weighing $3\frac{1}{2}$ lbs. and two woollen cloaks—*nonnulla munuscula*—he asked the bishop to procure him in return a pair of falcons of a breed, rare in Kent but common in Germany, which would attack cranes.[2] We have seen already how such a raw material as lead might form an acceptable gift,[3] and in any picture which we make of exchange in the early Middle Ages, the phenomenon of gift and counter-gift must be allowed a conspicuous place.

V

In attempting to assess the importance of trade in the Dark Ages, then, we have a body of 'positive' evidence for the existence

[1] Boniface, *Epistolae*, no. 69 (ed. M. Tangl, 1916, p. 142).

[2] *Ibid.*, no. 105 (pp. 230–1).

[3] *Cf.* also Alcuin's gift of 100 lbs. of tin—presumably lead is meant—to Archbishop Eanbald II of York for covering the bell-tower of the cathedral (*Epist. Karol. aevi*, ii. 370).

of traders and trade, another body of 'positive' evidence for the existence of various alternatives to trade, and a third body of 'neutral' evidence—mainly archaeological—for the distribution of wealth—goods or coin—by unspecified means. All that we know of the social conditions of the time suggests that the alternatives to trade were more important than trade itself: the *onus probandi* rests on those who believe the contrary to have been the case. In a few instances we can say definitely that trade was *not* involved: for example, Dr. Adelson's view that Byzantine lightweight solidi were struck for the convenience of merchants trading with the Germanic world[1] is contradicted by reiterated imperial legislation forbidding merchants on pain of death to export gold from the empire.[2] This case, however, is exceptional; in general, we do not know how coins or jewellery or similar objects reached their destinations, and with so many possibilities from which to choose any conclusions that we draw can only be of the most tentative description. Much evidence alleged to 'prove' the existence of trade proves nothing of the kind, and in dealing with the Dark Ages, in cases where we cannot prove, we are not entitled without a careful weighing of the evidence to assume.

[1] Above, p. 130 n. 4.

[2] *Cod. Just.*, 4.63.2; *Basilics*, 56.1.20. I hope to deal with this question in a forthcoming article in the *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*.

PEOPLE AND GOVERNMENT IN SOUTHERN ASIA

By Hugh Tinker, Ph.D.

READ 7 NOVEMBER 1958

ALMOST everywhere in southern Asia, forms of government have derived from the Hindu concept of kingship. The *Sukraniti*, a medieval political treatise, provides a statement of later Hindu belief:

> The King is the ruler, protector, and benefactor of the people . . . he is lord of this earth because of his deeds in the previous births . . . The King should make the subjects acquire the habits of performing their duties by the use of his terrible sceptre. . . . The Prince who is virtuous is a part of the gods. . . .[1]

This concept of royal Power—of a protector who was also an absolute and exacting ruler, was transmitted to neighbouring lands. Father Sangermano, who lived in Burma from 1783 to 1806, drew this picture of the reigning monarch, Bodawpaya:

> I suppose that there is not in the whole world a monarch so despotic as the Burmese Emperor. He is considered by himself and others absolute lord of the lives, properties, and personal services of his subjects; he exalts and depresses, confers and takes away honour and rank; and . . . can put to death not only criminals guilty of capital offences, but any individual who happens to incur his displeasure. . . . Every subject is the Emperor's born slave.[2]

His words are echoed by Sir John d'Oyly's description of the Kingdom of Kandy in its latter days: 'The power of the King is supreme and absolute. The ministers advise, but cannot control his will. The King makes peace and war, enacts ordinances, and has the sole power of life and death.'[3] Kingship was divine: in

[1] B. K. Sarkar, *The Sukraniti* (Allahabad, 1914), pp. 4, 6, 12.

[2] J. Jardine, *The Burmese Empire a Hundred Years Ago, as Described by Father Sangermano* (London, 1893), p. 73.

[3] Sir J. d'Oyly, *A Sketch of the Kandyan Kingdom* (London, 1832), p. 5.

Burma, the monarch was 'Lord of the Great Law', *Mintayagyi Paya*, and in Ceylon 'Sun of the Spotless Law', *Vimala Dharma Surya*. In northern India the Imperial might rested more upon conquest and military power. François Bernier considered that 'The Great Mogol is a foreigner in Hindustan. . . . He finds himself in a hostile country, or nearly so; . . . he is under the necessity of keeping up numerous armies, even in the time of peace'.[1] In Mughal India, the state was the army: Bernier described Delhi as 'a military encampment', and the Emperor was surrounded by immense bodies of troops when he proceeded on his leisurely state tours. This military flavour extended throughout the Mughal administration in the provinces and the districts.

In all the lands of southern Asia the aura of royal authority descended to the royal officials who were beings apart. Senior officials kept elaborate ceremony, and might only be approached as one approached a king. In Burma, the *shiko* was demanded by every official of rank. Officials were only to be approached with propitiatory offerings, and any request for official action was supplicated as a favour. The ordinary man avoided contact with authority if at all possible. The shadow of government fell across most of the peoples of the area in the form of taxation or the rendering of personal service, either military conscriptions, or more usually forced labour, the *begar* of India, *rajakariya* of Ceylon, *kerah* of Malaya and *sehna-hmu-dan* of Burma.

Often there were two kinds of authority, that of the king, the central government, and that of local society. Local leadership was seldom democratic, but it was acceptable because founded upon tradition. The *myothugyi* in Burma, or the *patel* in Maharashtria was a local hereditary worthy, not unlike the English squire. This kind of leadership was hedged about by custom; as in medieval rural England, custom was more familiar, and more honoured than the royal laws. The strongest bonds in the local community were those of the village. It formed a social unit, for defence and for livelihood, but it also provided emotional solidarity, a sense of brotherhood, to its members. The village was, of course, most strongly organized in areas of ancient settlement, as in the plains of India and in Ceylon; it was less compulsive in Burma and Malaya where society in the eighteenth and nineteenth

[1] F. Bernier, *Travels in the Mogul Empire* (A. Constable, London, 1891), p. 104.

centuries was still partly migratory. Village organization was also weakened when the landlord was able to exert pressure, as in eighteenth-century Bengal.

It was in Bengal, where social breakdown had, perhaps, proceeded furthest that British rule began. A vivid account of the attitude of the ordinary Bengali towards authority is contained in the reports of William Adam, a former missionary, who spent years inquiring into the state of the Bengal countryside. He wrote:

> The people of this country in their present condition cannot understand any other language than that of command proceeding from Government. They do not perceive the possibility of their standing in any other relation to their rulers than in that which requires obedience. . . . They are so completely bowed down by ages of foreign [that is, Mughal] rule that they have lost not only the capacity and the desire but the very idea of self government. . . . They have no conception of government as the mere Organ of Law and its sanctions. They view it simply as an Instrument of Power whose behests are absolutely indisputable and wholly independent of the voluntary co-operation of the individual members of the community.

He concluded:

> Mere power unsupported by the moral cooperation of the community is weaker than law would be with that cooperation; to call the latter forth must be one of the objects and efforts of education, by embodying with native public opinion the conviction that the interests of the state and its subjects are the same. [1]

But British administrators only came to accept such an interpretation of their obligations after half a century of inertia.

When British rule expanded from the management of a number of trading posts into the administration of a sub-continent there was no sudden transformation in forms of government. A Mughal façade was retained, with the Emperor in state at Delhi. British mints issued coins in his name, Muslim criminal law remained in force, and kazis sat in the courts. In collecting the land revenue, the British professed to adhere to Mughal practice, and utilized

[1] W. Adam, *Report on the State of Education in Bengal* (Calcutta, 1838), pp. 132–3.

the existing official hierarchy as the basis of their district administration. The East India Company did not have the resources to alter things radically, had the will existed, but their principal concern was to realize the revenue and to balance their books. In the intellectual sphere, many of the leading British officials such as Sir William Jones, the Judge, were pioneers of Sanscrit and Arabic studies, concerned to uphold and revive indigenous learning and social institutions. Towards the close of the century, a new spirit was stirring. Men like Munro and Elphinstone worked to conserve the social and political structure, and advocated the support of institutions such as the village council, the panchayat; but at the same time they emphasized the need to reform and reconstruct Indian society, laying stress on the employment of Indians in the administration and upon the promotion of education. Here are the first indications of a will to change Asian society which came to fullest vigour in the 1830's under the dual influence of Utilitarian and Evangelical ideas. These two great forces in British life are sometimes regarded as opposed in spirit, rationalism against religion, logic against conscience, and in politics, Radicals against Tory reformers. Yet (as G. M. Young has pointed out) the two movements were parallel rather than opposed, and had many qualities in common. In India and Ceylon the two became merged for practical purposes into one reform movement. This is aptly illustrated by the activities of Macaulay. By upbringing and association he was one of the 'Saints', yet his Penal Code is an outstanding Benthamite product. However, Macaulay as a political controversialist was not publicly associated with either group.

Utilitarianism operated most distinctly in legal reform in southern Asia; the two forces interacted in the great educational debate. Their influence rapidly gathered momentum during the early years of the nineteenth century, and by the 1830's effectively shaped the higher policy of the Government of India. In 1836, the *Friend of India*, the organ of the Baptist missionaries of Serampore, and the most powerful journalistic influence of the day in Asia, declared with confidence that the Indian Government 'is emphatically a government of progression',[1] a claim that could hardly have been advanced in any other period. The interplay of the two great forces is well illustrated in the pages of the *Friend of*

[1] *Friend of India*, Serampore, 28 January 1836.

India. For example, in reviewing Auckland's educational minute of 1839, John Clark Marshman, the editor, could write: 'In this matter we are simply Utilitarians, seeking the greatest good of the greatest number'.[1] As a further example, let us consider the language of Herbert Edwardes: of all officials, the most completely identified with Exeter Hall and Evangelism. He writes to a friend about the work of a district officer, in language which is lyrical in its exultation; yet as his climax, he uses words which to our generation come near to bathos. 'All this endeavour,' he says, 'must be allowed to be a lot of exceeding utility.'[2] At times one feels that these expressions are mere catch phrases. Just as today everyone in Asia professes Socialism (so that the moderate middle-class group in Singapore politics call themselves Liberal Socialists), one hundred years ago all were Utilitarians. Even that strange, remote man, Arthur Phayre, immersed in Burmese literature and history, is described in his work of rebuilding Rangoon as a practising Utilitarian.[3] Yet such was the spirit of the age.

The Utilitarian work of legal reform was applied mainly to criminal law, which was a tangle of differing practices and diverse religious sanctions. A Eurasian convicted under Muhammadan law of the crime of adultery was able to secure a pardon by claiming to be a Christian; 'a fact', commented Sir George Campbell, 'which certainly does not seem a mitigation of the offence'. The Act of 1833 revising the Company's Charter directed that 'all laws and customs shall be ascertained and consolidated'. The Governor-General's Council was to include a Legal Member, and a Law Commission was to carry out the reforms. Macaulay was appointed both Legal Member and head of the Commission; as Law Member, he hastened to write a letter to himself as President of the Commission, defining his new task. Macaulay's terms of reference provided almost a complete Benthamite manifesto. The proposed legal code, he declared 'ought not merely to be a digest of existing laws, usages and regulations, but . . . it ought to comprise all reforms in our criminal jurisprudence which the Commission may think desirable'. The principle laid down

[1] *Friend of India*, 8 April 1841.

[2] Lady Edwardes, *Memorials of the Life and Letters of Sir Herbert Edwardes* (London, 1886) i. 210.

[3] *Friend of India*, 16 June 1853.

was 'the ascertaining of truth with the smallest possible cost of time and money whether to the State or to the individual and the suppression of crime with the smallest possible infliction of suffering whether to the innocent or the guilty'.[1]

At the same time, a Commission of Inquiry was appointed to investigate administrative and judicial practices in Ceylon, its members being Colonel Colebrooke and C. H. Cameron, a barrister. Cameron's recommendations are very similar to Macaulay's. He assumed that British policy was directed to the 'improvement' of the 'native inhabitants', and his proposals were also directed towards uniformity, economy, and the abolition of social and political inequalities and outworn customs.[2]

Macaulay's Penal Code did not actually come into force until 1861, but thereafter it was extended to most of southern Asia. Burma received the Code as part of the Indian Empire, but it was also adopted in Ceylon, Malaya, and British Borneo. Although largely derived from alien legal concepts, and drafted entirely by Englishmen, it has been generally accepted into Asian usage. Along with the other legal codes—which were also accepted outside India—it stands as a monument to Jeremy Bentham, more wide-reaching than any legal reform in Britain itself.

The story of education is more complex, and the Asian response played a decisive part in shaping the course of development. To the Utilitarians, education was the grand means of effecting the improvement of society; Evangelical thought also saw education as a vital channel for the spread of Christianity, while the earlier group of Sanscrit and Arabic scholar-officials (usually termed the Orientalists) also had strong opposing views. Yet the deciding factor in the situation was the demand for a particular type of education put forward at this time by the Hindu middle class of Bengal. The demand issued generally from the rentier class largely created by the Cornwallis land revenue settlement, and more specifically by those Calcutta families (of whom the Tagores are the best known) who had become associated with Western activities, with banks and trading houses and with the new administration. The first colleges set up on a Western model

[1] Government of India, Law Department, letter of 15 June 1835.

[2] G. C. Mendis, *The Colebrooke-Cameron Papers; Documents on British Colonial Policy in Ceylon, 1796–1833* (London, 1956), i. 121.

were private ventures. The Hindu College was founded in 1817, largely by the exertions of David Hare, a rationalist watchmaker, and by Ram Mohan Ray, the Erasmus of the Bengal renascence. The following year, the Serampore Baptists established their famous college, which in 1827, when a charter was granted by the King of Denmark, attained university status, with power to issue degrees. Meanwhile, government policy was undergoing change. The so-called Orientalists were still in the majority, and only classical Indian learning received government support, but a new generation of British officials was coming forward, imbued with the new ideas. A despatch from the Directors dated 18 February 1824, said to embody the views of James Mill, laid down that:

> The great end should not have been to teach Hindoo learning, but useful learning. . . . In professing to establish seminaries for the purpose of teaching mere Hindoo or mere Muhammadan literature, you bound yourselves to teach a good deal of what was frivolous, not a little of what was mischievous, and a small remainder indeed in which utility was in any way concerned.

Nevertheless, no proposal was made for change. The Evangelical spirit may be detected in a subsequent despatch of 5 September 1827, in which the Directors emphasized that education must not only 'produce a higher degree of intellectual fitness, but [also] contribute to raise the moral character of those who partake of its advantages'.

The debate on educational policy, as is well known, was conducted at length in the Committee of Public Instruction, whose members included Macaulay, C. E. Trevelyan, and Prasanna Kumar Tagore. Behind the struggle over the question of government support for teaching in English lay some interesting presuppositions. The Orientalists, the opponents of change, were, in most cases, defenders of traditional Indian institutions, such as Sati; while some of the advocates of English saw it as an instrument in transforming Indian society. Alexander Duff, the Scottish missionary educationalist, vigorously advocated English teaching as a means of spiritual regeneration. 'The English language,' he wrote, 'opens up a whole world of new ideas . . . by the time young Indians have acquired a mastery over the English language . . . their minds are almost metamorphosed

into the texture and cast of European youth, and they cannot help expressing their utter contempt for Hindoo superstitions and prejudices.' [1] Macaulay, at any rate in private, went further. He told his father: 'Our English schools are flourishing wonderfully. . . . No Hindoo who receives an English education ever remains sincerely attached to his religion. . . . There will not be a single idolater among the respectable classes in Bengal thirty years hence. And this will be effected . . . merely by the natural operation of knowledge and reflection.' [2] This, as it seems to me, is an Evangelical sentiment expressed in pure Utilitarian terms. Not all the reformers argued thus. Trevelyan regarded the role of English as similar to that of Latin in renaissance Europe, a harbinger of a renaissance among the vernacular languages of India. Marshman, a distinguished Bengali scholar, also argued for teaching through the vernaculars. The triumph of English as the language of higher education really came about from the demand of middle-class Bengal. Dr. Ballhatchet and others have effectively shown that Macaulay's famous minute did not clinch the argument.[3] Indeed Auckland's education minute of 1839, designed to effect a compromise in the controversy, restored funds to Arabic and Sanscrit scholarship. The deciding factor was Hindu demand, which brought about the concentration on English teaching and higher education. When Hooghly College opened in 1836, there were 1,200 student registrations for the English classes within three days, and the statistics of the Committee of Public Instruction show that the numbers studying English in Bengal doubled between 1835 and 1836.[4] The explanation lay in the decision at this time to substitute English for Persian as the language of the higher administration and of the Courts. Henceforth, in the British dominions in Asia, fluency in English was a prerequisite of employment in all but the subordinate ranks of government service.

This pattern was reproduced in Ceylon. The Colebrooke-Cameron Commission came out flatly in support of English as

[1] Cited by C. E. Trevelyan, *On the Education of the People of India* (London, 1838), p. 41.

[2] G. O. Trevelyan, *Life and Letters of Lord Macaulay* (2nd edn., 1889), pp. 329–30.

[3] K. A. Ballhatchet, 'The Home Government and Bentinck's Educational Policy', *Cambridge Historical Journal*, x (1951).

[4] *Report of the Committee of Public Instruction*, Calcutta, 1837.

the language of the courts and the administration. It also argued forcibly for much greater participation by Ceylonese in government service, and to this end urged that educational effort must be concentrated within the English-teaching field, culminating in the creation of a new university. There was no opposition group in Ceylon to correspond with the Orientalists in India (apart from Sir John d'Oyly there were few scholar-officials) and the new proposals were carried even further than in India. English education was left largely in missionary hands; their schools were mainly located in the towns, and in consequence higher education became largely the prerogative of a narrow class: Christianity and urban middle-class status went almost automatically with higher education and government service.

The same pattern followed later in Burma and British Malaya, where, however, the peoples of these lands had to accept the competition of immigrants from India and Ceylon, who were already familiar with English, in some of the channels of government and commercial employment. The political, social, and economic consequences of English literary education remain a dominant influence in the life of southern Asia to this day.

Whereas English education was desired by the many as a means to advancement, a few were interested in Western ideas as a means of intellectual liberation. During the 1830's and 1840's there was a ferment of ideas in Calcutta. Most explosive was the teaching of Henry Derozio, a young Eurasian schoolmaster at the Hindu College. He was a follower of Tom Paine, and for a brief while the *Age of Reason* was much in demand. Young Brahmins affirmed that religion was dead, tore off their sacred threads, and took part in beef-eating parties, hurling the meat into the houses of the orthodox. Derozio was dismissed, he committed suicide, and the movement largely disintegrated. The second notable group was the Brahmo Samaj, the followers of Ram Mohan Ray. Their religion drew heavily upon Christian ethics, they abjured caste and social abuses such as sati. Their emancipation from caste helped to make them active participants in the political and social movements of the time. Ram Mohan and his principal supporter, Dwarkanath Tagore, were early visitors to England, and among the Indian students who came to England from the 1840's onward, to become doctors, barristers, and candidates for the civil service, a high proportion were Brahmos. The

third group of reformers were the intellectual Brahmin converts to Christianity. Small in number, they included some of the finest minds of their age, such as Michael Madhusudan Datta, the poet. Many of the first generation of college professors and other intellectual leaders were Christians such as W. C. Bonnerjea, first President of the Congress. Nowadays the doctrines of Christianity are not regarded as particularly revolutionary in Asia, but these young converts were making a decision unknown before in Hindu society, to become outcastes deliberately. The outburst against them was violent: even the liberal-minded Brahmo leader Prasanna Kumar Tagore disinherited his only son when he became a Christian.

Indeed, although these Western-inspired movements were important in introducing ideas of liberty, individual choice, equality, and social justice, perhaps they were even more important in the reaction which they aroused in Hindu society. Challenged by the reformers, particularly by Christianity, Hindu leaders sought support from within Hinduism as, later, Buddhists were to do in Ceylon and Burma. There was a return to the teaching of the Vedas, inspiring a series of movements. There was the orthodox Dharma Sabha led by Raja Radhakanta Deb, the puritan Arya Samaj founded by Swami Dayananand Saraswati, and the Vedanta movement leading to Swami Vivekananda's preaching of social service and renunciation. All these groups have contributed substantially to the ideology of Indian nationalism.

However, this is jumping ahead. While the effects of the Evangelical and Utilitarian movements are still distantly felt in Asia, the generous belief of the 1830's in perfectibility had largely disappeared by the 1850's. Yet, some reforms were still to come.

The last of the Company's Charters, that of 1853, was framed very largely in consonance with the views of C. E. Trevelyan, Alexander Duff, and John Clark Marshman, who were assiduous in their lobbying and in provision of evidence. The Charter provided for the introduction of competitive examinations for the Indian Civil Service. Macaulay, as chairman of the committee which drafted the scale of subjects to be offered by candidates, placed greatest emphasis upon English History and Mathematics, and excluded the Indian vernaculars from the list; this further underlined the pattern of higher education and of thought in

southern Asia. The Charter also included a declaration of educational responsibility, which was reaffirmed more specifically in the famous dispatch of 9 July 1854, drafted for the Secretary of State by Marshman and Duff. This sought to reproduce the system of village and district schools advocated by Trevelyan in the 1830's, but its most effective section was that devoted to the establishment of Indian universities on the model of the then University of London. In May 1857 the first list of matriculates was published at Calcutta. Of the 162 successful candidates, 135 were Hindus and 8 were Muslims; a measure of the extent to which Muslim society continued to cling to the Arabic and Persian culture of religion and social esteem.

At this moment when the new Asia, as we say, was being conceived, an Asia that turned eagerly to European thought and British political ideas, at this moment a change came over the British attitude to those under their charge. There was a gathering feeling that Asians were somehow different from—and inferior to—Englishmen. This change can be fully documented, but one quotation must suffice here. John Clark Marshman ended his long direction of the *Friend of India* in 1852, and he was succeeded by Meredith Townsend, later editor of the *Spectator*. The change symbolizes the change of attitude, for we find Townsend commenting on proposals to alter the legal status of Europeans in India in March 1857 (before the Mutiny): 'all the parliaments in the world cannot make a native and a European equal'.[1] This change did not go unnoticed at the time. G. O. Trevelyan recorded in 1863 that he had been re-reading the files of the *Friend of India* for 1836. He observed: 'The tone of the articles indicated the existence in Anglo-Indian society of a spirit which has passed away and left but little trace . . . 30 years ago the education of the people of the country was the favourite subject of conversation.'[2] He went on to describe the contempt for Indians, the racial arrogance of his own day. It is not easy to understand how this change occurred. Obviously, the Mutiny accelerated the process. But this was not only an emotional change, it was an intellectual change also. The difference can be detected in that classic statement of the later Utilitarian position,

[1] *Friend of India*, 12 March 1857.

[2] G. O. Trevelyan, *The Competition Wallah* (2nd ed., London, 1866), p. 238.

John Stuart Mill's *Representative Government*. Mill virtually excludes from his review of government all consideration of the political emancipation of non-European peoples under British rule. He strongly supports the idea of a non-political, professional civil service as the best means of governing India, but he also argues against the precipitate introduction of English political institutions, and for 'a much more profound study of Indian experience and of the conditions of Indian government'.

The Queen's Proclamation of 1858 appears to contradict this new emphasis on racial difference. The Queen, instructing Lord Derby who drafted the Proclamation, distinctly emphasized that it 'should breathe feelings of generosity, benevolence and religious feeling, pointing out the privileges which the Indians will receive in being placed on an equality with the subjects of the British Crown'.[1] But this declaration (long treasured by Indians —Dadabhai Naoroji was still quoting it fifty years later) was not to be fulfilled. The *Friend of India* puts its finger on the problem (1861): 'Our rulers preferred the inconsistency of proclaiming an impossible equality without practising it.' This, it was suggested, could only lead to Indian unrest: 'Equality in theory is a running sore in the Government of India; equality in practice means the exclusion of the English from India.' [2] Faced with this dilemma, the British in India adopted a policy of marking time. This was especially the policy of Lord Lawrence's administration, and it was endorsed by the erstwhile reforming *Friend of India* in these terms: 'Avoid change; by removing obstructions rather than by supplying new stimulants, slowly develop, but do not violently upheave native society; leave rich and poor to themselves and their natural relations within the limits that prevent oppression' (1873).[3]

The principal political innovation—the introduction of municipalities—reflected these considerations. Although this measure was instituted without any prior demand by Indians, it was intended (at any rate in part) to reflect the spirit of Indian social and political institutions. This is made clear in the Resolution of August 1864, issued by Lord Lawrence's government:

> The people of this country are perfectly capable of administer-

[1] A. C. Benson and Viscount Esher, *The Letters of Queen Victoria* (London, 1908), iii. 298. [2] *Friend of India*, 19 December 1861.
[3] *Friend of India*, 25 December 1873.

> ing their own local affairs. The municipal feeling is deeply rooted in them. The village communities . . . are the most abiding of Indian institutions. . . . In the cities also, the people cluster in their wards, trade guilds and panchayats and show much capacity for corporate action. . . . Holding the position we do in India, every view of duty and policy should induce us to leave as much as possible of the business of the country to be done by the people . . . and to confine ourselves to . . . influencing and directing in a general way all the movements of the social machine.[1]

The modest measures of local self-government of the 1860's and 1870's did little to kindle political awareness. Local worthies could not accept a system of government by consultation, while all real authority remained in the hands of government officials. The old panchayat, so often referred to, did not constitute a precedent. That had been a village or caste or trade gild affair, essentially a private organization in which the hand of government was not concerned. But in the new municipalities the district officer or another senior official sat in the chair. The municipal councillors did not approach him as petitioners, yet, how could they speak to him as equals, especially as his was the last word upon every item? Lord Hobart, Governor of Madras, observed quite bluntly (1874): 'The population of a municipality does not govern itself. . . . A municipality is in fact an oligarchy dependent upon a superior power which may control its action to almost any conceivable extent.' [2] The reforms of Lord Ripon were calculated to remedy this situation by removing the officials from membership of the boards. His proposals were designed (in the words of the Resolution of May 1882) 'as an instrument of political and popular education'. But whatever changes of form were made, it was not possible, in terms of accepted custom and usage to reconcile the position of an independent non-official chairman of a local body with the continuing prestige of the district officer, to whom men automatically looked as 'the government'. Only in the great cities did the experiment succeed to any extent. In these the district officer was merged into the social fabric; he was a magistrate, not the embodiment of supreme power; while

[1] H. Tinker, *The Foundations of Local Self-Government in India, Pakistan and Burma* (London, 1954), p. 36.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 38.

at the same time there was a class of politically mature, independent professional men who were capable of operating the new political machine. Bombay in particular, with its enlightened, caste-free Parsi community made a reality of municipal government. But this was partly achieved by devolving all executive authority upon a Municipal Commissioner, an Indian Civil Service officer, with independent powers that were more in conformity with German than with English municipal practice. A recital of the names of the leading Bombay councillors reads like a roll-call of early Indian nationalism: Pherozeshah Mehta, Dadabhai Naoroji, Badrudin Tyabji, and many more. But this political experience was confined to the few. The great mass of the people continued to have an authoritarian concept of government: and paradoxically it was in the great ports, least typical of social conditions in general, that most success was achieved.

Local government was long regarded as the principal avenue of political development, so that as late as 1918 the Government of India was declaring: 'it is on the increased experience to be gained in the administration of local affairs that the country must to a large degree rely for the expansion of its self-dependence in the sphere of central government'.[1]

Yet as early as the 1880's the middle class were searching for a wider stage for their aspirations. But what were they looking for? Few, if any, would have replied: 'national independence'. And what form did their ideas take? Few would have answered: 'parliamentary democracy'. But there was a demand that Indians should play a worthy part in the administration of their own country. The British rulers received this demand with notable lack of sympathy. In the 1830's, British policy-makers had responded readily to the Indian desire for Western education. In the 1860's, the British displayed much less certainty in the attempt to provide a means of political expression to Indians through local self-government, supposedly adapted to Indian conditions. In the 1890's and thereafter, British opinion set itself (with only few dissenters) firmly against the transplanting in Indian soil of any kind of copy of the English parliament. How can one explain this flight from the earlier belief in the extension of English institutions to Asians?

[1] H. Tinker, *The Foundations of Local Self-Government in India, Pakistan and Burma* (London, 1954), pp. 110–11.

The growth of a racial attitude has been mentioned. In November 1889, Lord Salisbury commented on Dadabhai Naoroji's attempt to enter parliament: 'I doubt if we have yet got to that point of view where a British constituency would elect a black man.' [1] This 'black man' speech was widely condemned, nevertheless the fact that a British Prime Minister could publicly utter such a sentiment is some indication of the extent of racialism. This attitude of contempt particularly focused upon the Western-educated middle class. The attitude of many British officials is expressed (if with unusual candour) by John Beames in a statement to the Aitchison Commission in 1886. This John Beames has been described by Philip Woodruff in *The Men Who Ruled India* as 'being very near that strange abstraction, the average district officer'. [2] He declared:

> I say that mere book learning is not sufficient to qualify an officer for the higher posts in the administration of British India. If you take a native and teach him English, he does not thereby acquire the qualities of an Englishman—courage, determination, vigour, and other qualities which an Englishman possesses. In the course of my long experience I have constantly found natives deficient in courage, shirking responsibility, careless and indolent. From what I have seen of the large number of natives who have served under me during the last twenty-nine years, I do not think they possess the qualifications which fit them to be admitted to the Covenanted Civil Service.[3]

At this time there were only twelve Indian members of the Indian Civil Service. Can we rationalize this rejection of the class created by education in an English image? Was disillusionment caused because English education had not brought about mass conversions to Christianity, as Macaulay had prognosticated? Perhaps; but there was also a feeling abroad that the new Indian universities were providing a parody of university education. They were, in a sense, too successful. Numbers increased rapidly.

[1] R. P. Masani, *Dadabhai Naoroji: The Grand Old Man of India* (London, 1939), p. 263.
[2] P. Woodruff, *The Men Who Ruled India: The Guardians* (London, 1954), p. 56.
[3] Public Service Commission, *Proceedings* (Calcutta, 1887), vi. 50.

In 1864 the total number graduating B.A. in India was 50. In 1885 it was 554, and by the end of the century, 1900. This expansion was accompanied by a visible lowering of standards, although for every student who graduated there were five or more who failed. A distinguished Indian professor, Lal Behari Dé, observed as early as the 1870's: 'The students of the present day never open their mouths in the class room—unless, indeed, it is to make a noise. They take down the professor's words, commit them to memory—often without understanding them—and reproduce them in the examination hall. A copying machine would do the same.' [1] A student who underwent this exercise in memorizing was not, in truth, the equal of men from Jowett's Balliol or Whewell's Trinity. But one cannot wholly deny that the British reaction was governed by a desire to exclude educated Asians from what C. P. Snow calls 'the corridors of power'. Following the early Indian successes in the Indian Civil Service examination, the age limit was lowered, in 1878, to 19 years: as Lord Salisbury plainly stated, to exclude candidates from Indian Universities. Similarly the holding of examinations in Colombo for the Ceylon Civil Service was abolished in 1880, and thereafter Ceylonese candidates had to compete under difficulties in London.

As the Indian middle-class demand for fuller participation in the civil service and in the legislative councils gathered strength, this was resisted. The emerging Congress was dismissed as a 'microscopic minority' (a phrase first used by Lord Dufferin in 1888). The view which prevailed in influential British circles right into the twentieth century was well expressed in the speeches from the Conservative benches in the debate on the Indian Councils Amendment Bill in 1892:

> 'Who are the people of India?' asked Curzon, then Under Secretary for India when introducing the bill. 'The people of India,' he went on 'are the voiceless millions who can neither read nor write. . . . The people of India are the ryots and the peasants whose life is not one of political aspiration but of mute penury and toil. The plans and policy of the Congress Party in India would leave this vast amorphous residuum absolutely untouched. . . . That party contains a number of

[1] G. Smith, *Life of Alexander Duff* (London, 1879), i. 456.

> intelligent, liberal-minded and public-spirited men . . . but as to their relationship with the people of India, the constituency which the Congress Party represents cannot be described as otherwise than a microscopic minority of the total population.'

In the same debate, Sir Richard Temple went further and asserted that the Congress 'have no influence at all among the mass of the people. They are looked upon as semi-foreigners.' [1]

This 'microscopic minority' theory influenced British policy for almost half a century. On the one hand, any movement towards an Indian parliament was resisted; on the other, alternative representation to that of the 'minority' was sought. An attempt was made to bring forward the 'natural leaders' of society, a description which was applied to the princes and the landholders. Members of aristocratic families were introduced into the higher civil service and into the councils. Unfitted both by lack of Western training and by disinclination from taking these responsibilities, the leading families failed to provide the desired counterpoise. While the urban middle class continued to fill all elected offices in the legislatures and municipalities, the authorities continued to stress the need for adequate representation of all the various 'interests' (landlords, commerce, the martial classes, and so on). This is perhaps more intelligible if the purpose of the legislative councils as then defined is remembered. In making proposals for the admission of Indians to the councils Sir Bartle Frere wrote in 1860 of the necessity 'of learning what the natives think of our measures and how the native community will be affected by them'.[2] Non-official members were not asked to make or even modify policy but to act as a channel of communication between the Viceroy and the peoples of India. Frere's comparison with the darbar of an Indian prince is illuminating. British speakers continually denied that the Legislative Councils bore any resemblance to Parliament. At the same time they looked for some formula which would ensure that representatives from all the principal 'interests' were brought forward. This was the origin of communal representation rather than any recognition on the British side of a definite cleavage between Hindus and Muslims. From this point of view, the Congress claim to represent

[1] H.C. Deb., 28 March 1892.

[2] Cited in *Report on Indian Constitutional Reforms* (Cd. 9109), London, 1918, p. 51.

India was rejected, not because Congress was largely Hindu, but because it was almost entirely composed of lawyers.

If British policy was obscure, the infant Congress was not much more definite in its ultimate objectives. It was an apt choice that led Pherozeshah Mehta to close his presidential speech to the sixth annual Congress at Calcutta in 1890 by quoting (or rather misquoting) Cardinal Newman:

> Keep thou my feet, I do not ask to see
> The distant path—one step enough for me.[1]

The Congress concentrated on such relatively humdrum issues as the recruitment of Indians to the civil service, and the extension of the permanent land settlement. The language in which they presented humble addresses to Viceroys and Governors was so exaggeratedly fulsome, even servile, as to mirror the traditional attitude to government as something high, almost sacred. But, as the government proved both unresponsive to flattery and indifferent to criticism the voice of impatience was heard more urgently.

Beside the hostility of official circles in India there could be placed sympathy from Liberals and Radicals in England, and a dual image of England came to be held. The idea grew of appealing against the British official class in India to the heart of the British people. If British officialdom had failed to sympathize, surely the real England would listen. In 1890 the Congress sent a deputation made up of its leading men to tour England—Hume, Mehta, Surendranath Banerjea, W. C. Bonnerjea, and others. They established cordial relations with many in the Liberal party. For a number of years the Congress supported a British committee and published a journal, *India*, under considerable financial loss. Prominent Congress-men, notably, Dadabhai Naoroji, Lal Mohan Ghose, and Bonnerjea, contested English constituencies as Liberal candidates. Naoroji, when elected for Finsbury, called himself the Member for India. In the 1880's and 1890's there was some inclination to seek formal representation for India in the House of Commons (surprisingly, Tilak placed this high amongst his demands). The pattern of political emancipation was obscure. Gradually, many Indians came to identify their situation with that of Ireland, and to adopt Irish aspirations and techniques as their

[1] C. Y. Chintamani, *Speeches and Writings of the Hon. Sir Pherozeshah M. Mehta* (Allahabad, 1905), p. 312.

own. It will be recalled that the Irish Home Rule proposals formulated in the 1880's fell very short of self-government. Similarly, the phrase 'Home Rule' which began to be heard in India, meant a condition far short of independence. The further development of the Irish problem had repercussions on Indian thinking. Home Rule appeared to be resisted by a majority of the representatives of the English people. To an increasing extent, the Irish movement took on the character of a people's struggle for freedom against a repressive British government. The parallel and almost entirely constitutional evolution of Canada and the other Dominions received little notice. Increasingly, the Irish demand was backed by force. Within parliament, in the cities of England, and in the Irish countryside, violence was the weapon of a significant section of the Home Rulers. The climax came with the Easter Rising, followed at once in India by the setting up of Mrs. Besant's Home Rule League. Before Irish independence was finally conceded, there had been a full-scale civil war. The lesson was drawn in India and Burma that Britain would capitulate to force when she would not listen to reason.

Within the Congress movement a division began to appear between those who accepted the 'political education' principle, with its implication of the necessity for Asians to train themselves for self-government by means of education and social and civic service—and, on the other hand, those who maintained that Indians had the right to their own country and that the foreign rulers must be regarded as invaders to be expelled. The division was not absolute, and a leader like Surendranath Banerjea who belonged by conviction and association to the 'political education' school nevertheless had sympathies with the militants. The militant nationalists were strongest in two areas where a linguistic culture was most self-conscious and coherent; Maharashtria looked back to the struggle of Shivaji against the Mughals; Bengal drew upon a religious 'Mother' cult, but some young Bengalis, like the followers of Derozio long before, turned to the revolutionary movements of Europe for their model. Muslim leaders exhibited much the same kind of divisions. The followers of Sayyid Ahmad Khan accepted British rule with every expression of enthusiasm as a means of gaining time to train a generation of Western-educated Muslims who could compete with middle-class Hindus on equal terms. Sayyid Ahmad had a two-fold task:

to persuade the British Government to maintain the prevailing balance of power, and to persuade his own community to accept a synthesis of Islamic and Western education. As early as 1872, he was writing about the 'two races' in India, observing: 'It cannot be expected that Mahommadans who are made of much sterner material than Hindus will adapt themselves so readily to this changing age. Let us have time, let us live, work, and wait.' [1] Yet other Muslim thinkers turned away from the path of Western education and tutelage, and looked back to their Islamic inheritance and to the days of Mughal greatness.

In so far as the new political awareness appeared to reflect regional or religious loyalties, this served further to confuse English political thinking upon the purpose of British policy in southern Asia. During the 1890's and 1900's, even Liberal thinkers appeared to move away from their earlier conviction in nationalism and democracy as political universals. In the day of the Italian Risorgimento, national self-government had been accepted as a natural expression of men's ideals, while trust in the sovereign people had been the basis of Gladstone's later thought. But to the following generation, wearied by the narrow and conflicting claims of Balkan national groups, nationalism had become suspect, while belief in rational political choice was crumbling in the era of Northcliffe's *Daily Mail*, the Suffragettes, and Freud and the subconscious. With regard to India, this loss of faith (for it was almost that) was expressed in a postponement of consideration of political reform to the undefined future. This was justified, firstly, because Indians were different from Englishmen and therefore unable to operate representative government; and secondly, because the unity of India depended upon British supremacy, and this unity would dissolve, should the British withdraw. Progressive thinkers such as Graham Wallas accepted these views. Lord Bryce, turning from his exposition of democracy in Anglo-Saxon lands, made a comparison between the Roman and British-Indian Empires. Dealing with the paradox that a democratic nation was denying the same liberties to nations under her charge, he observed: 'Everyone admits in his heart that it is impossible to ignore the differences which make one group of races unfit for the institutions which have given energy

[1] Syad Ahmad Khan, *Review on Dr. Hunter's 'Indian Musulmans'* (Benares, 1872), p. 51.

and contentment to another more favourably placed.' Were Britain to surrender India, then 'its political unity, which depends entirely on the British Raj, would vanish like a morning mist. Wars would break out, . . . which might end in the ascendancy of a few adventurers, . . . Pathans, or Sikhs, or Mussulmans of the north-west. The Marathas might rise in the west. The Nepalese might descend upon Bengal. . . . To India severance from England would mean confusion, bloodshed, pillage.' [1]

The effect of these ideas upon British policy was further to confuse its purpose. Every reform in India from 1909 onwards contributed towards the goal of an independent, parliamentary democracy: yet every reform was accompanied by such equivocal statements by the politicians concerned that Indians came to disbelieve in the sincerity of British proposals. The continual harping on the diversity of India led the Congress to stress upon every occasion the complete unity of India, so that differences were brushed aside as evidence of British propaganda.

It would not have been surprising if the decay of Liberal beliefs in Britain had led Indians to become disillusioned by this seeming betrayal. There was, of course, a turning away from Liberalism, particularly among the rising generation of leaders. But Liberalism, out of fashion in Europe, remained surprisingly potent in India. Not only was there a party of intellectuals, the Indian Liberal Federation, which exercised continual pressure towards the acceptance of parliamentary government, but also Congress continued to hold many Liberals, who remain a strong minority influence among elder statesmen today.

Round about 1921 Indian politics took on a new character. In the words of Dr. Rajendra Prasad, the non-cooperation movement launched by Gandhi 'shifted politics from the drawing-rooms of the educated and the business men to the huts in the countryside, to the tillers of the soil'.[2] Until then, political demand had been voiced by small middle-class groups whose ideas were separated by a void from those of the ordinary villager. It was Gandhi's achievement to create a bridge between the intellectuals and the village folk, and to shatter what Gandhi termed the 'pathetic contentment' of the mass of the people with

[1] J. Bryce, *The Ancient Roman Empire and the British Empire in India* (London, 1914), pp. 32, 77.

[2] Rajendra Prasad, *Autobiography* (Bombay, 1957), p. 131.

their lot. The major problem of a student of politics in southern Asia is this transformation of social and political ideas which has taken place within his own lifetime. It demands the utmost care in assessing attitudes at successive stages of time. This was an era in which, every five years or so, a significant advance occurred. In this narrow period, the student has constantly to be on guard against that commonest of historical failings, reading history backwards, in accepting evidence regarding the political climate of 1930, let us say, as evidence for belief and attitudes in 1924.

The great political innovation of the 1920's and 1930's was Gandhi's non-cooperation movement, directed towards dissolving the traditional attitude of respect, and indeed of subservience towards the authority of the government. In a series of campaigns, he led hundreds, sometimes thousands, of ordinary folk to defy the policeman, the tax-collector, and the magistrate; all the traditional figures of power. This movement was directed mainly against a government that was foreign, a government of conquest, but in part it was directed against government as such; centralizing, power-absorbing government, which Gandhi believed to be contrary to the true spirit of India.

This rejection of authority has brought about in India (and also in Burma, where similar means were employed) an attitude today which is strangely divided. Vestiges of the traditional respect, even subservience towards authority remain, but they are intermingled with a spirit of defiance which is constantly demonstrated in student disorders, in the politics of mob madness, and even in a diminution of the ancient peasant acquiescence in the immutable orders of the government.

The non-cooperation movement also raised the question of methods. Gandhi preached non-violence, and his teaching has become the orthodoxy of modern India. But non-violence, as Gandhi visualized it—an attitude of mind as well as of the body—is a state which few can ever attain. Many of the Congress leaders, notably Subhas Chandra Bose, rejected the way of non-violence and actively preached the use of physical force. The national struggle was marked by a steady series of political murders and incidents of violence, culminating in the rising of August 1942 throughout Bihar and eastern Uttar Pradesh. These events posed a dilemma for Gandhi and other like-minded

leaders, a dilemma which was never squarely faced. This was characteristic of the national movement with its white-hot concentration upon one goal—independence—to the exclusion of all lesser considerations. The approach of British statesmen and their advisers could hardly have been more opposed. They were concerned almost entirely with detail, with solutions to problems of institutional structure, and with reconciling the claims of the various interests. The attempt was made to apply the techniques which had worked so well in the face of political demands by the British colonies of settlement, by the British labouring classes, and by English women: proceed cautiously, step by step, and make the malcontents members of the club, converting agitators into committee-men. These intentions clashed directly with the ideas of the Indian leaders. Their reaction can be illustrated by the comments of Motilal Nehru in the Central Legislative Assembly (1925) on the forthcoming appointment of a Reforms Enquiry Committee. He speculated on the questions which the committee was likely to ask:

> What is the state of education in India? What progress have representative institutions made? Whether these people deserve any further progress or whether it is necessary to send them down a form or two to learn their lessons better . . . ? Now, that is the sort of thing that we are objecting to. We say we are absolutely fit for self government, as fit as you are in your own island. This is what we say. Here we are occupying that position and you tell us as you would tell schoolboys: be good boys and you will be promoted to a higher form.[1]

The consequences of this concentration by the Congress upon the goal of independence was, it may plausibly be argued, to speed up the tempo of emancipation (although Sir Ivor Jennings believes that this is not so).[2] But another result was a disregard for all the consequences of independence. There was no debate within the Congress upon the forms of government to be adopted and no attempt at constitutional experiment by the Congress leaders. Apart from the brief experience gained in the provincial governments, 1937–39, and the participation of a few leaders,

[1] Indian Legislative Assembly Debates, 7 September 1925.

[2] Sir I. Jennings, *The Approach to Self-Government* (London, 1956), ch. 12.

such as Sardar Patel in municipal government, the new leaders acquired no familiarity with the techniques of administration. When independence came, the governments of India and Pakistan took over the existing structure of government, as formulated in the 1935 Government of India Act. At the same time they leaned heavily upon their senior civil servants.

The role of the civil service in southern Asia remains so influential that it must be noticed. Despite constitutional changes which had brought in a wide measure of ministerial responsibility, and had transferred the management of local affairs to elected bodies, the higher civil service still dominated the machinery of government right up to independence, and in effect represented 'the government' in the popular imagination. This preponderance was rendered somewhat less objectionable because the old jibe about the Indian Civil Service (echoing Voltaire's observation on the Holy Roman Empire) that they were neither Indian, nor Civil, nor Servants, was becoming rapidly less true in the first particular. In 1915 there were some 63 Indians in the élite civil service, or about 5% of the total. By 1928 (including listed posts) there were 333 Indians or about 25%, and by 1939, 625 Indians or some 45%. Other superior services, such as the Forest Service, Engineers, Educational Service, Audit, etc., ceased to recruit Englishmen in the 1920's, and were predominantly Indian by 1939. In Ceylon the process went further. British recruitment ceased (except for a handful) in 1931, so that before independence the higher civil service was largely Ceylonese. In Burma and Malaya the process of change was much slower. India, Pakistan and Ceylon entered independence with a cadre of picked, trained men who have filled almost every key post in the years that followed.

These men represented the cream of their countries' brains, but how far, in an age of stirring nationalism, were they separated from their countrymen? The national awakening made surprisingly little difference to the attraction of the higher civil service for young intellectuals. Dr. Rajendra Prasad relates in his autobiography how he secretly made plans to go to England to compete for the Indian Civil Service; but his secret came out, and he was forced to give way to the conservatism of his parents. It was chance rather than fundamental ideological divisions which made one man a civil servant and another a militant politician.

The explanation partly lies in material advantage, partly in the satisfaction which derived from a career of opportunity and responsibility, but mostly in the massive prestige which still attached to a high official in Asia. The position of the Indian administrators was equivocal; some identified themselves completely with the professional esprit de corps of their service; others were more conscious of the barrier which separated them from their colleagues of the ruling race. But in general they formed an exclusive group, a separate caste, the 'Heaven born' as they were called. With the coming of independence this situation was strangely perpetuated. Independence brought gigantic and largely unanticipated problems, such as the flood of refugees and the communal madness. In these testing days, the new Congress or League Ministers, and the old senior civil servants strove together, through crisis after crisis, and developed a close fellow feeling which tended to place them both apart from the rank and file politicians who were not involved in the struggle. Sardar Patel, for example, came to identify himself closely with the administrators to the extent of threatening the Constituent Assembly with his resignation if certain clauses protecting officials were not written into the constitution. And so the higher civil service are still the 'Heaven born', a class apart. As well as being aloof from the ordinary people they are largely isolated from those levels of thought which are so closely associated elsewhere in determining trends and in formulating policy: the politicians and the intellectuals. Their attitude to the administrators can be summed up as envy and frustration. The Indian member of parliament, conscious that he is the elected representative of one million people, envies the district officer in his vast palladian bungalow, with the national flag above, and a sentry at the door. The young lecturer who by academic achievement has gained a place in a university department envies his former class-mate who succeeded in the civil service examination (every year 25% of Indian Administrative Service appointments are made from competitors who already have posts in universities). The change-over to parliamentary democracy will not be successfully completed until civil servants have made a conscious effort to adapt their role to the new social conditions. But politicians and intellectuals must respond by modifying their present touchy and negative attitude.

The continuing image of government is of a power apart: at

best a protector, at worst an oppressor to be propitiated or evaded. Gandhi's non-cooperation movement had the effect of weakening the authority of government, but did little to afford the peasant a consciousness that government is founded upon 'we, the people'. The need to persuade the peasant that he is identified with his own government is underlined by the poverty of southern Asia. Faced with shortages of capital and equipment, the planners see one potential asset, a labour surplus. How can this labour be mobilized to construct rural roads and wells, buildings for social service activity? The solution advanced in India, Pakistan and Burma is to appeal to the community to come forward with its labour and materials. This approach has a deeper importance than the purely economic end; it can serve to encourage ordinary villagers to take the initiative instead of looking always to the government. Mr. Nehru goes so far as to suggest that community projects are important 'not so much for the material achievement that they would bring about, but much more so because they seem to build up the community and the individual and to make the latter the builder of his own village centres and of India in the larger sense'.[1]

Yet community development at once came up against the prejudices of a thousand years. The villagers viewed the organizers sent in by the government with intense suspicion. A United Nations report states that 'some mistook project workers for foreign agents. . . . The general feeling of the villagers was that another department had been set up for the purpose of enhancing taxation.' [2] The provision of labour was regarded as the reimposition of forced labour, the *begar* of former days. The new projects were advanced only by pressure from the official organizers: the much-discussed 'Balvantry Report' says plainly: 'One of the least successful aspects of the Community Development work is its attempt to evoke popular initiative.' [3] However, this community spirit is already coming to life, here and there, admittedly in the most prosperous and advanced villages. A

[1] Prime Minister's inaugural speech at the Development Commissioners' Conference, May 1952.

[2] H. Belshaw and J. B. Grant, *Report of the Mission on Community Organisation and Development in South and South-east Asia* (UN Pubns., 1953), p. 118.

[3] Committee on Plan Projects, *Report of the Team for the Study of Community Projects and National Extension Service* (New Delhi, 1957), i. 5.

traveller returning to India after an absence of only twelve years finds surprising evidence of change, as for instance in the new participation by women in community work. Listening to the villagers relating their achievements and their plans, one is conscious of a new spirit arising. The ordinary people of Asia are about to speak.

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS

By Professor the Rev. M. D. Knowles, Litt.D., D.Litt., F.B.A., F.S.A., F.R.Hist.S.

READ 13 DECEMBER 1958

GREAT HISTORICAL ENTERPRISES
II. THE MAURISTS

A YEAR ago our theme was the work of the Bollandists. Their name suggests immediately, to all acquainted with European historiography, the name of another body of religious, many of them the contemporaries of Henskens and Papebroch, and it would be impossible to omit from even the shortest list of great historical enterprises the achievement of the Maurists. The two bodies of men and their work, nevertheless, have little in common save an equal devotion to accurate scholarship. What impresses us in the history of Bollandism is its continuity of spirit and undeviating aim over more than three hundred years, during which a very small but perpetually self-renewing group has pursued a single narrowly defined task, which is still far from completion. With the Maurists, on the other hand, it is the magnitude, the variety and the high quality of the achievement that strikes the imagination. While the Bollandists, a small family in a single house, have in three centuries produced in major work no more than a row of sixty-seven folios, the Maurists, in a little more than a hundred years, published matter enough to stock a small library, and left behind them letters, papers and transcripts which have been used and exploited by scholars for nearly two centuries since. Indeed, it would be both impossible and alien to the scope of our interests to attempt the briefest survey of Maurist scholarship in its entirety, and my remarks to-day will be confined to their publications on European history after the decline of the Roman Empire. Who were the Maurists, and wherein lay their peculiar excellence?[1]

[1] There is no adequate and critical modern history of the Maurists. Dom P. Denis, who hoped to write one, contributed valuable articles to the early

The Maurists, to give them their proper style, were Benedictine monks of the Congregation of St Maurus. Their origin was as follows.[1] The wars of religion and of the League had overtaken the monastic order in France before it had been able to profit by the reforming spirit of the Council of Trent and the Counter-Reformation. When peace and order returned to France many of the abbeys were desolate, others were decadent, and in many of the greatest and wealthiest the system of commendatory abbots remained as a legacy from the Middle Ages. The early years of the seventeenth century, however, saw a great revival of spiritual life in France.[2] It was the epoch in which all that was best in Spanish and Italian piety crossed the Alps and the Pyrenees, and in which a flowering of French sanctity and genius, and a spirit of union in well-doing, gave a new life to the Church, before the bitter and blighting wind of religious discord and political rivalry soured the spring's bright promise of sunshine and fruit. In every region and institute new life stirred, and the great political churchmen of the age, the cardinals La Rochefoucauld and Richelieu, gave help in their own ways and measures. One of the reforming decrees of Trent had ordered the formation in each province or region of a monastic Congregation, that is, a confederation of neighbouring houses bound together by a single

numbers of the *Revue Mabillon* (then devoted largely to Maurist history), but did not live to fulfil his promise. The fundamental literary sources are those of the Maurists themselves, some of which have only been printed in recent years: Dom E. Martène, *Histoire de la Congrégation de Saint-Maur*, ed. Dom G. Charvin (9 vols., Ligugé, 1928–43); the same writer's *La vie des justes*, ed. Dom B. Heurtebize (3 vols., Ligugé, 1924–26); the *Nécrologe . . . de Saint-Germain-des-Prés*, ed. J. B. Varel (Paris, 1896); Dom P. Tassin, *Histoire littéraire de la congrégation de Saint-Maur* (Brussels, 1770), completed by U. Robert (Paris, 1881) and U. Berlière and H. Wilhelm (Paris, 1908). The vivid studies by E. de Broglie of Mabillon and Montfaucon (see below) are selective, though scholarly (Paris, 1888, 1891); the account by Dom P. Schmitz in his *Histoire de l'Ordre de Saint Benoît*, v (Maredsous, 1949), pp. 266–77, is short. For manageable lists of Maurist writings, see article 'Maurists' in *Catholic Encyclopedia* and 'Mauristes' in *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique* and (less manageable) *D*[*ictionnaire d'*]*A*[*rchéologie*] *C*[*hrétienne et de Liturgie*]. Dom H. Leclercq has much relevant material in *Mabillon* (2 vols., Paris, 1953–57).

[1] *Cf.* P. Schmitz, *Histoire de l'Ordre de S. Benoît*, iv (1948), pp. 21–52.

[2] The best account of this is in H. Bremond, *Histoire littéraire du sentiment religieux en France*, iii, 'La conquête mystique' (Paris, 1921).

code under an organized authority and system of discipline. One such group was initiated in 1600 in the monastery of Saint-Vanne at Verdun by a saintly reformer, Dom Didier de la Cour (1550–1623); it flourished greatly and soon counted numerous houses in its federation. Lorraine was not at that time part of the kingdom of France, but the reform soon spread across the frontier and even reached Paris. Here political difficulties quickly arose, and it was decided to form a separate congregation of the French houses; this was achieved in 1618, and the new federation took as its patron St Maurus, the disciple of St Benedict who, as the early legend ran, had brought the Rule and the spirit of the patriarch of western monachism to the monastery of Fleury-sur-Loire.

One of the principal aims of all Benedictine reforms since the early fifteenth century had been the replacement of the outmoded copying of manuscripts and compilation of chronicles and encyclopedias by learned work based on the humanist education and the critical methods of the Renaissance. The Congregation of Saint-Vanne had given a large place in its legislation to the fostering of studies and learning, and this ideal had been part of the legacy inherited by the younger Maurist body. That the daughter succeeded in eclipsing her mother so notably in this respect was due to a number of coincident advantages: the spirit of the age in France, the appearance of a great legislator followed by a succession of scholars of genius, and the acquisition of headquarters in the capital at a moment when Paris became, for the second time in her long history, the intellectual centre of Europe.

The seventeenth century, or more exactly the period from about 1630 to 1730, was a golden age of scholarship. The great and absorbing theological controversies of the Reformation, in which almost all the great minds of the age had been engaged, were now near spent, and a period of relative peacefulness began; throughout Europe a generation of highly educated and civilized men, full of curiosity and appreciation of the history and writings of the distant past, was able to review the treasures, printed and unprinted, that had been assembled in the great libraries and collections of Europe.[1] The spirit of the age, which witnessed so many triumphs of mathematical discovery and the first great advances in natural science, showed itself in the humane disciplines as an

[1] For this movement in England, see D. C. Douglas, *The English Scholars* (2nd ed., London, 1951).

influence in the direction of criticism and analysis. Moreover, there appeared on every side in France an outpouring of genius comparable to that which had been seen in Italy in the fifteenth, and in Spain in the sixteenth century.

The Congregation of Saint-Maur was fortunate, soon after its beginnings, to have as its superior-general Dom Grégoire Tarrisse (1575–1648), an ex-soldier and administrator who became a monk at the age of forty-nine and soon rose to high office, largely owing to the discerning patronage of Richelieu.[1] He revised its constitutions, transferred its headquaters to the ancient abbey of Saint-Germain-des-Prés, and used all his abilities and energies to make learned work the distinguishing employment of its monks. In this he was aided by the organization of the Congregation. The traditional Benedictine monastery has always been a fully autonomous abbey, ruled by an abbot elected for life. This system in the later Middle Ages had proved resistant to reform, and matters had been rendered still worse by the prevalent abuse of commendatory abbots, by which the monks were deprived at once of most of their revenues and of their rightful head. Many of the reforming congregations had endeavoured to avoid these ills by giving supreme power to a general chapter or a superior-general, and even (as in the case of Saint-Maur) by making the congregation, not the individual monastery, the unit to which a monk belonged by profession, and within which he could be moved about at will by his superiors. This reduced the commendatory abbots, who still existed in considerable numbers, from a position of control to one of patronage only. Dom Tarrisse had thus a free field in which to develop his programme. The two essential features were an exceptionally long course of studies, including besides philosophy and theology a thorough grounding in the classics and a thorough study of church history, and a centralization of talent at the Paris house. While intellectual ability was not, and could not be, even with the Maurists, a *sine*

[1] For Mabillon's appreciation of Dom Tarrisse, see preface to *Annales O.S.B.*, vi. *Cf.* F. Rousseau, *Un promoteur de l'érudition française bénédictine: Dom Grégoire Tarrisse* (Bruges, 1924), and H. Stein, 'Le premier Supérieur général de la Congrégation de Saint-Maur: Dom Grégoire Tarrisse', in *Mélanges* [*et documents . . . de Mabillon*] (Paris, 1908), pp. 49–89. *Cf.* also E. Bishop, 'Richelieu and the Maurists', in *Downside Review*, xxx (1911), 271–90, reprinted in *Liturgica Historica* (Oxford, 1918), pp. 462–74.

qua non of admission to the habit, the knowledge that a severe course of study must be traversed, and that mental work of one kind or another was the approved pursuit of the body, must have tended to direct talent towards their houses. Once a monk's long training was completed, his local superior was instructed to do his best to direct his subject's interest towards some aspect of patristic or historical work. If after a few years he showed unusual promise, he might hope to be sent to Saint-Germain-des-Prés. There and throughout the congregation, a policy of library-building was adopted; a careful list was drawn up of the essential books, and further purchases were made to meet the needs of the individuals. The library of Saint-Germain itself, which inherited the manuscript treasures of Corbie, soon came to be one of the best equipped in Europe, and the monks had in addition facilities to visit and even to borrow from the Royal Library and Colbert's library and the many rich and private collections of Paris.

But though encouraged and directed, Maurist studies were in early days never rigidly blue-printed and organized. There was nothing of the institute, the team or even the seminar, at Saint-Germain in the seventeenth century. The great works were in general, and especially in the lifetime of Mabillon, conceived and executed by a single scholar, who in time selected one or two younger colleagues to help and perhaps to succeed him. When once a project had been approved and was under way, however, a scholar could draw upon his community, and even upon the whole congregation, for assistance in copying manuscripts, reading proofs, indexing and the like, but there was never a 'director' of research or publication, nor was the whole congregation a 'learned body'. It would seem impossible to estimate the numbers of those actually engaged upon literary work. The whole congregation held between three and four thousand monks, and a contemporary put the number of scholars at forty,[1] but this, if at all accurate, can only have included those actually engaged as principals in producing published work; the number of those

[1] Nicole (cited by Leclercq, *Mabillon*, p. 566, from Bremond, *L'Abbé Tempête*, p. 183), wrote: 'Il n'y a pas quarante religieux dans la congrégation [de quatre mille] qui fassent une vie d'étude.' This would seem to be the source of Leclercq's own statement (*Mabillon*, p. 545): 'les Mauristes comptaient une quarantaine de savants sur un total de trois [*sic*] mille religieux environ'.

engaged directly or indirectly in technical assistance, the collection of materials and private study must have been considerably greater. Nevertheless, even if the number of scholars is put at a couple of hundred and the total number of monks at three thousand, the percentage is still a very low one.

Besides books and manuscripts, the Maurists had three sources of assistance characteristic of their age; conversation, correspondence and foreign travel. The learned reunion, the *conversazione*, was an essential feature of life at Saint-Germain. For almost a century, from the rise of Luc d'Achery to the death of Bernard de Montfaucon, the abbey was the scene of regular weekly gatherings of all scholarship and much of the connoisseurship of Paris and France.[1] Either in the spacious cell of d'Achery in the infirmary, or in the garden of the abbey, or later on the road to Suresnes and its *déjeuners*, projects were discussed, information exchanged, and all the latest discoveries and books aired for criticism. While Du Cange and Baluze debated with d'Achery and Mabillon, the young Michel Germain and Thierry Ruinart could listen and learn. The brilliance of these gatherings, the galaxy of talent and power to be found among the visitors to Saint-Germain—Hérouval, Bignon, Fleury, Bossuet and Fénelon; Le Tellier, Colbert, the archbishop of Reims, Le Tellier's son, the Abbé Louvois, son of the minister, the cardinals de Bouillon and de Coislin, the duc d'Aumont and the duc de Chevreuse—all these, and many more, have been preserved for us in the correspondence of the abbey, as they are preserved in the Memoirs of Saint-Simon and the pages of Emmanuel de Broglie.

Thirdly, there were the *voyages littéraires*, the long expeditions across France or Europe in search of manuscripts to copy, books to buy and antiquities to visit. Here, as we saw last year, Henskens and Papebroch were first in the field, but the journeys of Mabillon and his younger companions, and those of Martène and Durand, are more familiar owing to the literary record left by Mabillon himself, to the voluminous correspondence between the travellers and their friends, and to the descriptions and drawings of monuments and architecture that have been preserved.[2]

[1] The *locus classicus* is E. de Broglie, *Mabillon et la Société de l'Abbaye de Saint-Germain-des-Prés à la fin du dix-septième siècle* (2 vols., Paris, 1888), pp. 52 ff.

[2] Mabillon described the German tour in *Vetera Analecta*, iv, pp. 3 ff.,

It would be quite impossible to give in a few pages even an outline of the historical work of the Maurists, and a catalogue of books and names would be both useless and tedious. Altogether, the Maurists were 'in production' for a century and a half (c. 1640–1789), and four phases can be seen in their work. The first, from 1640 to 1665, is the pre-Mabillon period of individual and undirected effort, in which the single great figure of d'Achery slowly emerges to propose methods and a programme. The second period, from 1665 to 1707, is the age of Mabillon, in which his own works and those of his disciples and companions fill the foreground. The third phase, 1708–1741, is dominated by the two eminent scholars Martène and Montfaucon. The fourth, from 1742 to the end, is the age of the *epigoni*, the lesser men. Within the periods, the character of the work shows a gradual evolution. In the first, it is sporadic and individual; a history here, an edition there, a series of collections of texts. In the second, we can see the programme of Tarrisse and d'Achery unfolding in the work of Mabillon and his immediate associates; this is the era also of the editions of the Latin Fathers. In the third, the Greek Fathers are edited under Montfaucon, and Martène is working on liturgy. This third period merges into the fourth, which is the period of large-scale works and series on the one hand, and of numberless regional and civic histories on the other.

If Dom Tarrisse was the originator of the Maurist idea, the man to embody it in work done and in plans laid down was Dom Luc d'Achery (1609–85). It was he who, as counsellor to the superior-general, outlined the programme of patristic texts and historical collections that formed the germ of the Maurist achievement; it was he who, as librarian, built up the magnificent collection of books and allowed the Sunday afternoon reunions of scholars to develop in his room, and it was he who chose, received and taught Mabillon.

The programme devised by Tarrisse and d'Achery had three divisions; first, a general history of the monastic order, culminating in a history of the Maurist congregation; secondly, a collection of the lives of monastic saints; and thirdly, new editions of the monastic writers of the Middle Ages. All these objects were attained in great part by the *Acta Sanctorum O.S.B.*, the *Annales*

'Iter Germanicum', and the Italian experience in *Iter Italicum* (1687). Both E. de Broglie and H. Leclercq give full accounts.

O.S.B. the *Histoire littéraire* of the Maurist Congregation itself, the many histories of individual monasteries, and the editions of Bernard and others. In a later generation, as we have seen, the plan proliferated: lives of the early martyrs and others were added to those of monks; texts of the Fathers, Greek and Latin, were undertaken; a series of auxiliary disciplines were charted; a number of 'aids' for historians were compiled; and the latest Maurists began to conceive the whole past of France as their province.

When Mabillon joined d'Achery in 1664 a great quantity of material had already been assembled at Saint-Germain. Admirable as were the industry and perspicacity of d'Achery and his new lieutenant, the preparatory work of collection had already been largely accomplished. Had this not been so, the achievement of Mabillon in his first years at the abbey, prodigious as it was, would have been quite impossible. As things were, a steady stream of folios soon began to flow.

Mabillon stands by himself in a class apart in the history of Maurist scholarship, and even the shortest account must contain a sketch of his life and work.[1] Born of humble country stock in Champagne in 1632, and clothed a monk of Saint-Remi of Reims, he was sent to several houses in poor health before attracting the attention of d'Achery while at Saint-Denis. He became a member of the community of Saint-Germain in 1664 and within a few months took the place of d'Achery's lieutenant, Claude Chantelou, recently dead. Within four years he had shown his mettle with an edition, for which much of the preparatory work had been done by others, of the works of St Bernard, which he adorned with notes and introductory notices. This edition in its revised form (1690) became, and still remains, the standard edition, though it is on the point of being superseded by that of Dom Jean Leclercq. Concurrently with the work on St Bernard, Mabillon had been assisting d'Achery in the produc-

[1] For Mabillon, the essential books are: Dom T. Ruinart, *Abrégé de la vie de Dom Jean Mabillon* (Paris, 1709; Latin translation, Padua, 1714; reprint of French life as *Mabillon*, Maredsous, 1933); E. de Broglie, *Mabillon* (see preceding note 1, page 174); above all, H. Leclercq, art. 'Mabillon' in *DAC* and *Mabillon* (above, note 1, page 169). For a short sketch, see M. D. Knowles, 'Jean Mabillon', in forthcoming number of *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* (October, 1959).

tion of a series of volumes containing lives of the monastic saints arranged chronologically; six appeared between 1668 and 1680. These were much more than a series of texts; Mabillon contributed prefaces and a series of excursus to each; in the former he reviewed what would now be called the spirituality of the period concerned, in the latter he selected difficult or controversial points of monastic and liturgical history and dealt with them critically and magisterially. These works were received with enthusiasm by the learned world of Europe, and it was realized that a new star of considerable magnitude had appeared in the firmament. It was not, however, till 1681 that he showed his true quality of genius. The work which appeared in that year, the *De Re Diplomatica*, which is generally regarded as its author's masterpiece was, like many another masterpiece, an 'occasional' work, the outcome of a challenge.[1] When Mabillon was a young man, diplomatic—the science, that is, of criticizing manuscript charters and official letters and documents of all kinds—did not exist. Hitherto every controversial point had been tackled in isolation, but in 1675 the great Bollandist scholar, Daniel Papebroch, had taken a step forward. In the *Propylaeum* or introduction to the second volume of April saints he had propounded a number of rules for discriminating between genuine and spurious charters, and had condemned as spurious a series of early monastic charters of Saint-Denis and Corbie. Mabillon saw that the authenticity of a whole class of documents was at stake, and resolved to extract from all the charters and diplomas of which he had knowledge their characteristics of writing, style, form, dating, signature, sealing and the rest, and to propound thence rules for the authentication of various types of record. In less than six years, and without abandoning his other commitments, he had done his work, and it is the measure of his learning and his genius that the first major work on diplomatic was definitive on its subject. Methodically and patiently, with admirable lucidity and economy, Mabillon proceeded over the whole field of palaeography, linguistics, chronology, sphragistics and the rest, providing abundant examples and facsimiles, and passing with ease from the broadest principles to the smallest detail.

It is a testimony not only to the genius of the writer but to the

[1] The best analysis of *De Re Diplomatica* is that of L. Levillain in *Mélanges*, pp. 195–252.

society of his times that the work gave almost instant fame to its author throughout Europe, and a fame not only among fellow-scholars but among all educated men—the kind of fame that in different disciplines and centuries has been attained by a Galileo and an Einstein. In truth the *De Re Diplomatica* had not only created a discipline but had provided adepts with a text-book which was not ousted for almost two centuries, and then only by works which embodied its spirit and much of its detail. Mabillon, both then and thereafter, made errors of detail, but by and large his own rules should have served to prevent his lapses. He was weakest, perhaps, in philology and in some of the material details of palaeography. But his confreres, who produced a revised (but in many ways less satisfactory) third edition of his work were justified in writing: 'His system is true, and whoever would build on foundations other than his, will build on sand.' Papebroch, in a justly celebrated exchange of letters, accepted his conclusions and begged to be considered his pupil, and the great palaeographers of the past century, Sickel, Tangl, Giry, Delisle and Traube have continued to proclaim his eminence.[1]

We cannot here follow Mabillon on his journeys, nor trace the great controversies, such as those with Armand de Rancé and with the opponents of the Benedictine edition of Augustine, in which he became engaged. Two further achievements must, however, be mentioned. The one is his pioneer work on Gallican and Roman liturgy, which had its source in the discoveries, including those of the Luxeuil lectionary and the Bobbio missal, made on his travels, and which was published in the treatise *De liturgia gallica* (1685) and in the texts and studies of his *Museum Italicum* (1687, 1689), which in the judgment of liturgists of to-day set him in the very front rank of their predecessors;[2] the other is the *Annales O.S.B.*, which contain his ripest reflections and are, in the realm of 'straight' history, his greatest work. In them he wrote the narrative of monastic history from St Benedict to the death of St Bernard, based directly on the literary and charter

[1] The words of L. Traube may be taken as representative (*Vorlesungen*, ed. P. Lehmann, München, 1909, i, p. 22): 'So sehr ist darin alles monumental und nicht für den Augenblick, sondern für die Unsterblichkeit geschrieben.'

[2] *Cf.* H. Leclercq in *DAC*, x (i). 529–30. 'Il n'avait pas eu de devancier dans cette œuvre [sur l'office gallican] et on peut dire qu'il n'a pas eu d'imitateur.' But had Leclercq forgotten Edmund Bishop?

material with which he was so familiar, while to each volume he prefixed a long introduction giving a survey of the period and its characteristics. Mabillon commanded a Latin style of great lucidity and flexibility; he had an appreciation of the greatness and melancholy of human things and a sense, rare in his age, of the development of institutions and of the movement of cause and effect. In consequence, these introductions still retain their power to move the imagination and enlighten the mind.

Mabillon died on 27 December 1707, in his seventy-sixth year. He died, as he had lived, a simple monk surrounded by his brethren, and his resting-place was marked by a stone recording no more than name and date. He had refused a comfortable abbacy some years previously, and had come near receiving the cardinal's hat from his friend, Clement XII. His devoted pupil and companion, Thierry Ruinart, wrote almost immediately a short and intimate account of his life, dwelling particularly on the events of his last days. It is the work of an affectionate admirer, but all that we know of Mabillon from his writings and recorded acts confirms the picture given by his friend. Mabillon, indeed, stands next to the Venerable Bede, whom he resembles so closely in mind and character, as an embodiment of the ideal monk-scholar, whose type has re-appeared, recognizable if less perfectly chiselled, in numberless figures from Alcuin and Aelfric to Dom André Wilmart and Dom Ursmer Berlière. In distinction of mind, in humanity of outlook, in critical acumen and in intellectual power he was acknowledged as pre-eminent in an age of great men, and the judgment of Coulton, that he remains the greatest monastic historian[1], will not easily be gainsaid by anyone who considers the whole field of the European past. Above and beyond his great qualities of critical vision, and his truly phenomenal industry which was so admirably focused on the appointed task, he had a sobriety and warmth of feeling, a moderation, a selflessness and a charity, that carried him above the sphere of scholarship into the company of good men who are loved as greatly as they are admired. Unassuming, gentle, and lovable as he certainly was, Mabillon was severe and austere with himself, an undaunted seeker after truth and an upholder of principle in

[1] *Five Centuries of Religion* (Cambridge, 1921), i, p. 3: 'There is no monastic historian who for learning and impartiality comes even into the same class as Mabillon.'

word and in work; if he loved peace and ensued it he was also prepared to resist aggression and falsehood. The Maurists were fortunate, in their own day and ever since, to have had such a champion and representative of their ideal.

With the death of Mabillon, followed so soon by that of his gifted disciple Ruinart, what was in many ways the most illustrious period of Maurist scholarship came to an end. It was succeeded by what may be called the age of Martène and Montfaucon (d. 1741). Martène (1654–1739), 'le bon Emond' of Mabillon's letters, who died an octogenarian in 1739, was in many ways a survivor from another age.[1] His name is familiar to medievalists as the editor of two large collections of texts, the *Thesaurus novus anecdotorum* (5 vols., 1717) and the *Veterum scriptorum amplissima collectio* (9 vols., 1724–33). Like Mabillon and his two other disciples, Michel Germain and Thierry Ruinart, he was a monk of Saint-Remi of Reims. On his arrival at Saint-Germain he became the enthusiastic admirer and disciple of the then prior, Dom Claude Martin, son of Marie de l'Incarnation and one of the most saintly of the Maurists.[2] The attraction of Dom Claude was stronger than that of Mabillon, and Dom Edmond, after giving a measure of his quality by his *Commentary* on the Rule and his important *De antiquis monachorum ritibus*, followed his hero to Marmoutier in 1690 and, when Dom Claude died soon after, became his biographer in a saint's life which he published without permission and was in consequence sent in disgrace to a period of penance. Mabillon remained his friend, but for some reason Martène declined his invitation to return and help with the *Annals*. After Mabillon's death, however, followed shortly by that of Ruinart, 'le saint homme Emond' made amends to the dead by preparing the final volume for the press. He had also become the author of what is still the authoritative *Histoire de la Congrégation de Saint-Maur*.

Dom Bernard Montfaucon (1655–1741) was of a different stamp.[3] By birth and temper an aristocrat, he had worn the sword

[1] For Martène, see art. by H. Leclercq in *DAC*.

[2] For Dom Martin, see Dom E. Martène, *Histoire de la Congrégation de Saint-Maur*, vii. 131–58, and H. Bremond, *Histoire littéraire du sentiment religieux en France*, vi (Paris, 1922), pp. 177–226.

[3] For Montfaucon, see E. de Broglie, *Bernard de Montfaucon et les Bernardins* (2 vols., Paris, 1891).

for a short space before taking the habit and as a young man at Saint-Germain had from the first taken another path to that of Mabillon, and had become the indefatigable editor of the Greek Fathers, dealing in succession with Athanasius, Origen and St John Chrysostom during a period of fifty years, punctuated by a quadrennium as procurator in the Curia in succession to Claude Estiennot, a position in which he was the loyal advocate and adviser of Mabillon, then in the throes of a controversy on Augustine. After Mabillon's death Montfaucon succeeded him, both within the abbey, in Paris, and throughout the learned world, as the centre and chief ornament of Maurist erudition. Though always irreproachable as a priest and religious, Montfaucon was a degree nearer than Mabillon to being a man of the world. Vivacious, high spirited and of commanding presence, he was the host and leader of a group more worldly and free of thought and speech than Du Cange and Baluze, and study and social tasks broke in upon the solitude and observance of the later Maurists. Montfaucon was perhaps the most widely erudite of all his tribe. Besides his editions, he created, in his *Paléographie grecque*, a new discipline to put beside the medieval palaeography of Mabillon, and the work remained till very recent times the essential text-book. He followed these by two works of less permanent value which nevertheless contained a vast amount of erudite information and anticipated, by more than a century, the social and art history of modern times; these were *Antiquité expliquée* in fifteen volumes—a survey of the ancient civilizations and their remains —and the unfinished *Monuments de la monarchie française* (five volumes), which aimed at being an illustrated introduction to the artistic and social life of early France. Finally, now a very old man, Montfaucon produced in 1739, in two folio volumes, a catalogue of the manuscript collections in the whole of Europe of which he had taken notes for forty years, the *Bibliotheca bibliothecarum*.

Montfaucon was the last great Maurist. Already the titles of two of his later works, which won him such attention in his old age, reflect a change of outlook from that of Dom Tarrisse and Luc d'Achery. They have no kind of religious purpose, and they give an impression of a love of erudition and information for its own sake which is absent from all Mabillon's work. Montfaucon and Martène were indeed the last of the great age, and the former

was also the harbinger of a new epoch. Even before their death the sunlight had faded and a cold wind was springing up. Even though the warning light had been showing long before the death of Louis XIV, the catastrophe of the French church in the mid-eighteenth century must always startle and confuse one who has watched the splendours of revival only a century before, with its galaxy of saints and great men. When the great men departed with the *Grand Monarque* the high controversies lost their stature and spiritual warmth departed. The Maurists, like all other bodies, were rent by Jansenism, Gallicanism, and, as the century wore on, rationalism and secularism invaded the cloister. Nevertheless their work went on till the end, and much of it was technically of a very high quality, though much of it was also the collection of information on every kind of historical subject rather than research and publication of matter that was specifically monastic or ecclesiastical.

The last period is marked by the inception of several large-scale projects, none of which was in fact completed, and which were either 'wished on' the Maurists or undertaken by them with at least some encouragement from the publishers and booksellers.

The first in date was the *Gallia Christiana*. A book with this title, the work of Claude Robert, had appeared in 1626, and an enlarged and revised version, by several members of the Sainte-Marthe family, was published in 1656. The original intention was to provide a list of the occupants of all the sees of (modern) France from the earliest times, but the project gradually broadened, as such projects will, to include abbots and diocesan dignitaries. In 1710 the assembly of the French clergy had petitioned the superiors of the Maurists to undertake a new and more complete work, which should be an account of all the dioceses and abbeys of the country with lists and biographies of all office-holders. The request was granted, and to avoid controversies and jealousies it was decided to proceed alphabetically through the provinces beginning with Aix. The monks deputed for the project got down to work, and between 1716 and 1785 thirteen great volumes appeared and the province of Trèves had been reached. Still indispensable as a work of reference, *faute de mieux*, the *Gallia* enshrines accounts of individual abbeys by some of the most eminent Maurists.

Alongside of the *Gallia*, another enormous scheme was imple-

mented in 1721. This was a reflotation of a vast project of *Historiae Francorum scriptores* launched by André du Chesne in 1636, which had foundered after six of the proposed twenty-four volumes had been published. Dom Martin Bouquet was put in charge, and the work, entitled *Rerum gallicarum et francicarum scriptores*, but usually known by the first word of its French title as Bouquet's *Recueil*, ran to thirteen volumes between 1737 and 1786. It is in a sense the grandmother of all the great national collections: of the *Monumenta*, the Rolls Series, the Swedish, Danish and Portuguese *Rerum scriptores*.

Yet another heavy vessel was getting under way at the same time, the *Histoire littéraire de la France*, which, begun as a solo performance by Dom Rivet, by the outbreak of the Revolution had reached its twelfth volume and the middle of the twelfth century. But indeed there is no end to the Maurist catalogue, even if works of history alone are admitted, for besides a proposed edition of the councils of the French church, of the letters of the popes and of the historians of the crusades, a great series of monographs on the provinces and cities of the country poured forth during the eighteenth century, many of them containing the finest and most careful work of the scattered workers of the second rank in abbeys and priories throughout France.

Finally, a word should be said of the part taken by the Maurists in developing what are called the auxiliary sciences of history. Their most outstanding contribution has already been mentioned: the virtual creation of the sciences of medieval and Byzantine palaeography by Mabillon and Montfaucon. Of the two, Mabillon contributed far more than Montfaucon, for besides the strictly diplomatic and palaeographical parts of his great treatise, he helped on their way a whole group of lesser partners, such as numismatics and sphragistics. Only less important than the work of these two scholars was that of the group who produced the great treatise which they called *L'Art de vérifier les dates*. Like all similar works which include detailed lists and computations—like our own *Handbook of British Chronology*—it has proved peculiarly susceptible of correction and improvement, and has long been superseded, but for almost a century it was a vademecum of historians, and modern treatises and handbooks all trace a part at least of their ancestry to it.

Besides these major works, the Maurists were the first to

provide themselves with a series of bibliographical 'aids'. The first two were due to the enterprise of Dom Tarrisse and Dom d'Achery; they were a list of books that all libraries of the congregation should aim at possessing, and a directive, compiled by d'Achery at the request of Dom Tarrisse, to all houses as to the methods of research and the objects to be pursued in compiling the domestic history of the place. Mabillon, for his part, was responsible for two 'guides'; the one, a revised and enlarged version of d'Achery's circular, was his *Avis pour ceux qui travaillent aux histoires des monastères* (1677); the other was the long 'reading-list' that formed part of his *Traité des études*. To these must be added the great catalogue of manuscripts, already mentioned, compiled by Montfaucon, and the revision of Du Cange's *Glossarium* in 1733–36. It may indeed be said that the Maurists were the first body of historical scholars to realize not only the advantages and possiblities but also the needs of large-scale group-work, and therefore the first to provide tools and instructions, and to plan with an eye on the distant future. In this respect, at least, all subsequent institutes, academies and publishing committees of historians have derived, at first or last remove, guidance and inspiration from their achievement.[1]

The Maurists, like the Bollandists, were among the many casualties of the Revolution. Unlike the Bollandists, they did not again come into being when peace returned to Europe. The congregation of France, that owed its form to Dom Guéranger, respected the Maurist past, and many of its sons have taken inspiration from Saint-Germain, but it was in every way a new creation, with a traditional and different organization.

Nevertheless, what we may call 'Maurism' had a notable posthumous career. The literary remains of the monks scattered throughout the municipal and departmental archives of France survive principally in the Bibliothèque Nationale, where they have provided, and still provide, almost inexhaustible mineral wealth for historians and antiquaries, all the more so since transcripts and plans made by the Maurists are often the only witness

[1] C. V. Langlois, *Manuel* [*de bibliographie historique*] (2 vols., Paris, 1904), ii, pp. 296–7, remarks: 'On a pu, depuis, perfectionner ces ouvrages; mais les grandes lignes n'en ont pas bougé: les disciplines auxiliaires du moyen âge ont gardé jusqu'à nos jours la physionomie que les Mauristes leur ont donnée.'

that remains of charters and vanished abbeys. Next, there were the editions of the Fathers and medieval writers. Many of these continued to provide a steady income for publishers throughout the nineteenth century, and there must be few medievalists with European interests who have not one or more volumes on their shelves. They also proved a godsend to the Abbé Migne. Guéranger and Pitra, who acted as his advisers in early days, made full use of the Maurists, and the *Patrologiae* would have been far less valuable had their texts been unavailable; Migne also took the notes and prefaces of d'Achery, Mabillon and the rest, and reprinted them unchanged, save for a liberal scattering of misprints.

Over and above this, four at least of the great enterprises were resumed by other hands in the new age. The first, and least notable, was the continuation, in 1870, of the *Monasticum Gallicanum*[1] after a lapse of almost exactly two centuries. The *Gallia Christiana*, which was within sight of land at the Revolution, was completed *tant bien que mal* by B. Hauréau with the addition of three volumes covering Tours, Besançon (Vesontio) and Vienne (1856, 1860, 1865). As in the parallel case of the *Monasticon Anglicanum*, the volumes remain an indispensable but wholly inadequate work of reference, which all scholars would wish to see replaced, though the bravest heart would quail at the prospect of undertaking the task.[2] Two other works had somewhat better fortune. Bouquet's *Recueil*[3] was still in active course of production at the Revolution, and one of the collaborators, Dom Brial, retained many of the materials and continued, as *citoyen* Brial, to function as a man of letters in Paris throughout the years of upheaval. In the early years of the Empire the *Institut de France*, which replaced the suppressed academies of the old regime,[4] undertook the continuation of the work, which was soon deputed to the *Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres*, of which Dom

[1] For this, see *DAC.* xi. 2190–204.

[2] Brief notes on the *Gallia Christiana* are in Langlois, *Manuel*, ii, pp. 297–8, and L. Halphen, *Initiation* [*aux études d'histoire du moyen âge*] (Paris, 1946), pp. 102–3. *Cf.* also Pécheur, 'Précis sur l'histoire du Gallia Christiana', in *Bulletin de la Société archéologique de Soissons*, xv (1884), 127.

[3] For the Recueil, see Langlois, *Manuel*, ii, pp. 298–99, 374–75, and Halphen, *Initiation*, pp. 67–68.

[4] There is a short account of the re-creation of the various Instituts and Académies, 1795–1832, in Langlois, *Manuel*, ii, pp. 371–72.

Brial was elected a member. He was responsible, between 1806 and 1822, for five volumes, and the *Académie des Inscriptions* continued to be in charge throughout the nineteenth century; six more volumes appeared, the twenty-fourth and last in 1904. Gradually, however, the character of the enterprise changed. From being a collection (like our Rolls Series) of Annals and Chronicles it came to include record and economic material of all kinds. Indeed, it gradually became so amorphous and endless that sixty years ago it was decided to discontinue the work altogether. Meanwhile, a reimpression of the earlier volumes had been put in hand (from 1869), with the (at first glance) curious result that an early volume of a complete set may bear a later date than one that comes after it in the original series.

A somewhat similar, though on the whole more kindly, fate overtook the *Histoire littéraire* of Dom Rivet.[1] Here the last Benedictine volume had appeared in 1763, when the twelfth century had been reached. A committee of the reconstituted *Institut* took up the enterprise in 1807 with Dom Brial as one of the small commission, and vols. 13–16 were produced, after the fashion of the pre-Revolution volumes, before his death. He was succeeded as editor by the ex-Oratorian Père C. F. Daunon (d. 1840) and a gradual change began. Vernacular literature, which had formed no part of the original work, was dealt with and greater attention was paid to the individual writer and his works. From 1865 onwards the change was still more pronounced. A small commission of eminent scholars versed in history, literature and the new skills of philology produced a series of brilliant monographs with little or no connection with each other; names such as Emile Littré, Ernest Renan, Barthélemy Hauréau, Léopold Delisle, Gaston Paris, C. V. Langlois, Paul Fournier and their peers are a sufficient guarantee of the value and high scholarship of the work, but the series has become steadily more and more monographic in character, with many studies dealing with a single class of literature such as vernacular chansons or canon law studies. Moreover, there has been an increasing tendency to stray into by-ways, and to return in circles to pick up lost companions and signalize new discoveries. As a result,

[1] Langlois, *Manuel*, ii, pp. 299–300, 375–76; Halphen, *Initiation*, pp. 126–27. There is an interesting account of the development of the work by Langlois in the introduction to vol. xxxvi (1927).

during the last hundred years, the work has advanced chronologically by only half a century, and there would seem to be every likelihood that the Bollandists will have no difficulty in beating the *Institut* to the tape. As for the Maurists, one feels, they would have had the thing done in a workmanlike way fifty years ago.

The work of the Maurists remains, and may well remain for centuries to come, the most impressive achievement of co-operative, or at least co-ordinated, scholarship in the modern world. Alike in the boldness and the wisdom of its planning, the skill and success of its organization, the industry and long perseverance of its execution, and the high technical and intellectual quality of its content, the body of the Maurist work is a unique phenomenon in the history of scholarship. In mere bulk the printed output overwhelms the imagination of the beholder, and when we remember that for many of the Fathers and medieval writers the Maurist text and edition is still the most convenient, and sometimes also the best, available, our admiration comes to equal our amazement. Perhaps no one will appreciate this more fully than one who has himself lived and known the monastic life in more than one of its present-day manifestations, and who has had experience of the variety of talent and temperament, enthusiasm and discouragement, occupations and hopes, that every monastic family harbours in its midst.

That there should have been found, for well over a century, a constant supply of men equipped in mind and character with the qualifications fitting them to take a useful part in such a mass-production of learned work is not the least of the glories of the French genius. Indeed, the Maurists, or the minority of scholars among the Maurists, have succeeded in imposing upon the mind of educated Europe that they were the monastic norm, and not the brilliant exceptions, and that all other Benedictines were as they. Through their achievement the adjective 'learned' has come to be attached, as an *epitheton constans*, to the name of Benedictine, and no higher praise can be given to a monastic scholar than to call him a Maurist of to-day.

ROYAL HISTORICAL SOCIETY

REPORT OF COUNCIL. SESSION 1957–58

THE Council of the Royal Historical Society have the honour of presenting the Annual Report to the Anniversary Meeting as follows:

Two changes have taken place among the officers of the Society during the session. Professor Denys Hay has resigned as Literary Director on account of his appointment as editor of the *English Historical Review*, and Dr. R. W. Greaves was compelled to resign the Honorary Secretaryship because of ill health. Dr. P. Chaplais has been appointed Literary Director, and Mr. Alun Davies, Honorary Secretary, both appointments being subject to confirmation by the Fellows at the Anniversary Meeting in December 1958.

Good progress has been made during the session with the collection of material for *Writings on British History, 1901–1933*, which the Society is undertaking with the aid of a grant from the Ford Foundation. The Society continues to be represented on the Anglo-American Committee supervising the grant by Professor Helen M. Cam.

The representation of the Society upon various other bodies during the session was as follows:—Professor W. Rees served on the National Co-operating Body for the Social Sciences (for the purposes of Unesco); Professor J. G. Edwards (or, in the event of his being unable to attend a meeting, T. F. Reddaway) on the Advisory Council on the Export of Works of Art; Professor Margaret Deanesly, Professor A. Goodwin and Professor May McKisack (in succession to Professor R. Pares) on the British National Committee of the International Historical Congress; Professor J. G. Edwards on the Council of the British Records Association; T. F. Reddaway on the Standing Conference for Local History; Professor V. H. Galbraith on the Advisory Committee appointed by the Minister of Town and Country Planning

to supervise the listing of buildings of special architectural and historical interest; and Professor W. N. Medlicott on the Committee to advise the publishers of the *Annual Register*. P. Grierson continues to represent the Society upon a committee to regulate British co-operation in the preparation of a new Repertory of Mediaeval Sources to take the place of Potthast's *Bibliotheca Historica Medii Aevi*, and also represents the Society upon a committee formed under the chairmanship of Sir Frank Stenton to promote the publication of photographic records of the more significant collections of English coins. Professor W. N. Medlicott represents the Society on the Court of the University of Exeter. Professor Joan Hussey represented the Society at the International Byzantine Congress held in Munich in September, 1958.

The following volumes have been published during the session: *Transactions*, *Fifth Series*, Volume 8; *The chronicle of Walter of Guisborough*, edited by Professor H. Rothwell (allocated to the sessions 1955–56, 1956–57); and *Camden Miscellany*, Volume 21 (*Camden*, *Third Series*, Volume 90), containing 'The chronicle attributed to John of Wallingford', edited by R. Vaughan and 'A journal of events during the Gladstone Ministry 1868–74', by the Earl of Kimberley, edited by Ethel Drus (allocated to the session 1957–58). *Texts and Calendars*, edited by E. L. C. Mullins, is in the press and should be published early in the new session. The new edition of the *Handbook of British Chronology* is in an advanced stage of preparation. Council have provisionally approved for future publication in the *Camden Series* the following manuscripts:—*Earldom of Hereford charters*, to be edited by Dr. D. Walker; and the *Autobiographical memoir of Joseph Jewell*, to be edited by A. W. Slater.

The following papers were read during the session 1957–58:

'The Protestant constitution and its supporters, 1800–1829.' By Dr. G. F. A. Best. (12 October, 1957.)

'The new agriculture in Lower Normandy, 1750–1789.' By Alun Davies. (9 November, 1957.)

'The English farmers of the customs, 1343–51.' By Dr. E. B. Fryde. (11 January, 1958.)

'Rank and emolument in the British diplomatic service, 1689–1789.' By Professor D. B. Horn. (8 February, 1958.)

'Social origins and background of the English bishops during the reign of Edward II.' By Kathleen Edwards. (8 March, 1958.)
'The other face of mercantilism.' By C. H. Wilson. (10 May, 1958.)

The President, Professor the Rev. M. D. Knowles, delivered an address at the Anniversary Meeting on 14 December, 1957, on 'Great historical enterprises. I. The Bollandists'. The Alexander Prize was awarded to Dr. T. G. Barnes for his essay on 'County politics and a Puritan *cause célèbre*: Somerset churchales, 1633'. The essay was read at the meeting on 14 June, 1958. The annual garden party was held on 12 July, 1958.

At the Anniversary Meeting on 14 December, 1957, Professor J. G. Edwards was elected an Honorary Vice-President. The Vice-Presidents retiring under By-law XVII were K. B. McFarlane and Lady Stenton. Professor Helen M. Cam and Professor R. R. Darlington were elected to fill the vacancies. The members of Council retiring under By-law XVII were Professor W. L. Burn, Professor A. Goodwin, Professor H. Rothwell and Professor F. Wormald. J. S. Bromley, Professor H. A. Cronne, Professor H. J. Habakkuk and Professor J. M. Wallace-Hadrill were elected to fill the vacancies. Messrs. C. Ryland Beeby, Harmar & Co. were appointed auditors for the year 1957–58.

Council record with regret the deaths of 15 Fellows and 1 Corresponding Member. Among these, Council would mention specially Miss C. M. Ady, a member of Council from 1941 to 1944; Professor R. Pares, a member of Council from 1936 to 1939, and from 1940 to 1944; and Sir Jadunath Sarkar, a Corresponding Member since 1935. 22 Fellows, 6 Associates and 1 Library have resigned. 5 Fellows and 1 Associate have been removed from the Roll. 29 Fellows and 8 Associates have been elected and 12 Libraries have been admitted as Subscribing Libraries. 7 Associates have been elected to the Fellowship. The membership of the Society on 30 June, 1958, was 740 Fellows, 38 Corresponding Members, and 104 Associates. Of the Fellows, 241 were life members. The Subscribing Libraries numbered 429. 20 Societies, British and foreign, exchanged their publications with those of the Royal Historical Society.

The Anniversary Meeting on 14 December, 1957, decided to increase annual subscriptions as from 1 July, 1958, to four guineas

for Fellows, one pound ten shillings for Associates, and to three pounds ten shillings for Subscribing Libraries. It also decided to abolish compounding for life membership as from 14 December, 1957.

The Treasurer reports that the income of the Society for the year 1 July, 1957, to 30 June, 1958, exceeded the expenditure chargeable against it by £303. 11s. 1d. This sum has been allocated to Publications. The sum of £1,758. 11s. 1d. has thus been granted for Publications, as against £1,746. 12s. 8d. in the previous year, making, with the addition of the proceeds of sales, an allocation to the Publication Fund of £2,255. 9s. 6d., compared with £2,057. 19s. 11d.

I.—Income and Expenditure Account for the Year ended 30 June 1958

Dr.

1957	*Expenditure*	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
	Establishment Expenses		
197	Rent—96 Cheyne Walk	£180 0 0	
70	Rates	116 17 6	
25	Insurances, *less* Commission	32 13 11	
11	Repairs	10 18 5	
—	Furniture and Fittings	— — —	
59	Wages	54 12 0	
25	Extra Service and Cleaning	23 0 2	
23	Lighting and Heating	9 8 9	
11	National Insurance	14 7 5	
13	Catering	9 12 9	
—	Anniversary Meeting Expenses	18 0 0	
9	Sundries	8 11 9	
443			478 2 8
	Secretarial and Administrative Expenses		
500	Salary	600 0 0	
50	Superannuation	60 0 0	
234	Assistant Secretary's Salary	268 10 0	
25	National Insurance	29 5 8	
145	General Printing and Stationery (*less* Sales of Official Pamphlet, £1 4s. 0d.)	170 1 2	
47	Accountancy and Audit	47 5 0	
65	Postages	75 8 7	
17	Telephone	19 8 4	
30	Sundries	23 10 10	
1,113			1,293 7
	Other Charges		
4	Alexander Prize Medal and Expenses	6 5 0	
1	Friends of National Libraries	1 1 0	
1	British Records Association	1 0 0	
16	British National Committee of the International Congress of Historical Sciences	15 15 0	
—	Fee in connexion with Rates Appeal	12 12 0	
22			36 13 0
140	**Library**—Grant		140 0 0
50	**Contingencies Reserve Fund**—Grant		50 0 0
	Publications		
130	Director's Honorarium	107 10 0	
70	Other Secretarial Expenses	92 10 0	
	Publications Account:		
1,450	Grant	1,455 0 0	
311	Proceeds from Sales (*per contra*) transferred	496 18 5	
350	Writings on British History—Grant	350 0 0	
2,311			2,501 18 5
4,079	**Balance**, being Excess of Income over Expenditure for the year transferred as a further grant for Publications		4,500 3 8
297			303 11 1
£4,376			£4,803 14 9

Cr.

1957	*Income*	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
	Subscriptions		
	Received for 1958:		
119	Associates	£109 4 0	
1,198	Libraries	1,236 17 6	
1,521	Fellows	1,535 4 1	
2,838			2,881 5 7
71	Arrears of Subscriptions received		98 2 1
104	Life Subscriptions	137 0 6	
64	*Less* Proportion required by By-Law IX to be invested	85 19 0	
40			51 1 6
	Interest and Dividends		
336	From General Investments	383 4 11	
726	From Sir George W. Prothero Bequest	775 2 7	
41	Bank Interest	93 7 6	
1,103			1,251 15 0
13	**Royalties** From Sir George W. Prothero Bequest		18 10 11
311	**Sales of Publications**		496 18 5
—	**Sundry Receipts**		6 1 3
£4,376			£4,803 14 9

ROYAL HISTORICAL SOCIETY

II.—Balance Sheet 30 June 1958

1957		£ s. d.	1957		£ s. d.	£ s. d.
£	Funds		£	Investments		
28,635	Balances at 30th June 1958 as per Account III	27,885 2 9	6,978	General Account (Market Value at 30th June 1958, £7,814 9s. 0d.)	£6,967 7 0	
199	Subscriptions received in advance	325 12 6	20,283	Sir George W. Prothero Bequest (Market Value at 30th June 1958, £14,845 6s. 10d.)	20,264 5 2	
	Investment Reserve Account		27,261			27,231 12 2
353	As at 30th June 1957	353 0 8		Current Assets		
—	Barclays Bank Ltd.—Overdraft	688 16 5		Balances at Bank:		
			447	Current Accounts	100 0 0	
			1,334	Deposit Account	1,767 12 0	
			23	Post Office Savings Bank	23 5 3	
			120	London Trustee Savings Bank	129 12 4	
			2	Cash in Hand	10 7	
			1,926			2,021 0 2
				Note: The Society also owns the Library Furniture and Office Equipment at 96 Cheyne Walk, Chelsea, and a Stock of its own publications, the cost of which has been written off to Income and Expenditure Account.		
£29,187		£29,252 12 4	£29,187			£29,252 12 4

We have examined the foregoing Income and Expenditure Account and Balance Sheet with the books and vouchers of the Society.

We have verified the Investments appearing in the Balance Sheet. We report that the above Balance Sheet is, in our opinion, properly drawn up so as to exhibit a true and correct view of the state of the affairs of the Society, according to the best of our information and explanations given to us, and as shown by the Books of the Society.

C. RYLAND BEEBY, HARMAR & CO.,
Chartered Accountants, Auditors.

119/125, Finsbury Pavement, London, E.C.2.
31*st August*, 1958.

ROYAL HISTORICAL SOCIETY

III.—Statement of Funds 30 June 1958

	Balance at the Beginning of the year.		Grants and Additions during the year.		Expenditure and Withdrawals during the year.		Balance at the End of the year.
	£ s. d.		£ s. d.		£ s. d.		£ s. d.
The Sir George W. Prothero Bequest	20,296 18 3	(a)	1 8 5	(b)	5 2 9		20,293 3 11
Life Subscription Fund	3,136 12 0	(c)	85 19 0	(d)	80 6 0		3,142 5 0
Contingencies Reserve Fund (formerly Lease Renewal Fund)	710 5 10	(d)	80 6 0		—		840 11 10
		(e)	50 0 0				
Library Fund	91 13 6	(f)	145 5 0		199 3 4		37 15 2
Publications Fund (g)	2,859 11 2		2,257 11 6		3,364 11 9		1,752 10 11
'Writings on British History' Fund	530 6 1	(h)	350 0 0		61 17 11		818 8 2
General Fund	1,010 1 9		—	(i)	9 14 0		1,000 7 9
	£28,635 8 7		£2,970 9 11		£3,720 15 9		£27,885 2 9

REFERENCES

(a) Sale of fractional Shares.
(b) Loss on change of Investment.
(c) Proportion of Life Subscriptions received in 1958 and required by By-Law IX to be invested.
(d) Proportion of Life Subscriptions transferred in accordance with By-Law IX to Contingencies Reserve Fund.
(e) Grant for the year.
(f) Donation received, plus £140 Grant for the year.
(g) See Account IV.
(h) Grant for the year.
(i) Loss on change of Investment.

ROYAL HISTORICAL SOCIETY

IV.—Publications Account for the Year ended 30 June 1958

Dr. *Cr.*

		£ s. d.		£ s. d.
To Payments made during the year:			By Balance of Allocations at 30th June 1957, brought forward	2,859 11 2
Camden Third Series:			„ Allocation for Publications, 1957/58:	
Vol. 89	1,777 12 9		Grants	£1,758 11 1
Vol. 90	763 17 3		Proceeds of Sales (as per Income and Expenditure Account)	496 18 5
	2,541 10 0		„ Donation received	2 2 0
Transactions:				2,257 11 6
Vol. VII—Offprints	34 6 10			
Vol. VIII	664 1 4			
	698 8 2			
Volumes bought to replace Stock	33 6 1			
Warehousing of Stock	53 10 0			
Sundry Postages, Packing and Expenses	37 17 6			
	3,364 11 9			
Balance of Allocations at 30th June 1958 (required to meet cost of publications due to subscribers at date of account)	1,752 10 11			
	£5,117 2 8			£5,117 2 8

THE DAVID BERRY TRUST

Receipts and Payments Account for the Year ended 30 *June* 1958

Receipts

			£ s. d.
To Balance in Hand, 30th June 1957, brought forward from last Account, viz:			
Cash at Bank: Current Account	£45 5 6		
Post Office Savings Bank	54 11 11		
Cash in Hand	7 7		
£100 3% Defence Bonds (at cost)	100 0 0		
£200 2½% Defence Bonds (at cost)	200 0 0		
		400 5 0	
„ Dividends on Investments per Charity Commissioners		35 14 8	
„ Interest on £200 2½% Defence Bonds		5 0 0	
„ Interest on £100 3½% Defence Bonds		3 10 0	
„ Post Office Savings Bank Account		1 7 0	
„ Premium on 2½% Defence Bonds converted		2 0 0	
		£447 16 8	

Payments

			£ s. d.
By Printing and Postages			3 1 1
„ Balance in Hand—30th June 1958, carried forward, viz:			
Cash at Bank: Current Account	£88 14 7		
Post Office Savings Bank	55 18 11		
Cash in Hand	2 1		
£100 3½% Defence Bonds (at cost)	100 0 0		
£200 2½% Defence Bonds (at cost)	200 0 0		
		444 15 7	
		£447 16 8	

We have examined the above Account and find it correct.

119/125, Finsbury Pavement, London, E.C.2.
31*st August*, 1958.

C. RYLAND BEEBY, HARMAR & CO.,
Chartered Accountants, Auditors.

The late David Berry, by his Will dated the 23rd day of April 1926, left £1,000 to provide in every three years a gold medal and prize money for the best essay on the Earl of Bothwell or, at the discretion of the Trustees, on Scottish History of the James Stuarts I to VI in memory of his father, the late Rev. David Berry.

The Trust is now regulated by a scheme sanctioned by the Chancery Division of the High Court of Justice dated 23rd day of January 1930 and made in an Action 1927 A. 1233 David Anderson Berry deceased, Hunter and another v. Robertson and another.

This Society is now the Trustee, and the investment held on Capital Account consists of £634 17s. 2d. 3½% Conversion Stock and £540 13s. 2d. Treasury 2½% Stock 1975.

The Trustee will in every second year of the three-year period advertise in *The Times* inviting essays.

ALEXANDER PRIZE

The Alexander Prize was established in 1897 by L. C. Alexander, F.R.Hist.S. It consists of a silver medal awarded annually for an essay upon some historical subject. Candidates may select their own subject provided such subject has been previously submitted to and approved by the Literary Director. The essay must be a genuine work of original research, not hitherto published, and one which has not been awarded any other prize. It must not exceed 6,000 words in length and must be sent in on or before 31 January 1960. The detailed regulations should be obtained in advance from the Secretary.

LIST OF ALEXANDER PRIZE ESSAYISTS (1898–1958)[1]

1898. F. Hermia Durham ('The relations of the Crown to trade under James I').
1899. W. F. Lord, B.A. ('The development of political parties in the reign of Queen Anne').
1901. Laura M. Roberts ('The Peace of Lunéville').
1902. V. B. Redstone ('The social condition of England during the Wars of the Roses').
1903. Rose Graham ('The intellectual influence of English monasticism between the tenth and twelfth centuries').
1904. Enid W. G. Routh ('The balance of power in the seventeenth century').
1905. W. A. P. Mason, M.A. ('The beginnings of the Cistercian Order').
1906. Rachel R. Reid, M.A. ('The Rebellion of the Earls, 1569').
1908. Kate Hotblack ('The Peace of Paris, 1763').
1909. Nellie Nield, M.A. ('The social and economic condition of the unfree classes in England in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries').
1912. H. G. Richardson ('The parish clergy of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries').
1917. Isobel D. Thornley, B.A. ('The treason legislation of 1531–1534').
1918. T. F. T. Plucknett, B.A. ('The place of the Council in the fifteenth century').
1919. Edna F. White, M.A. ('The jurisdiction of the Privy Council under the Tudors').
1920. J. E. Neale, M.A. ('The Commons Journals of the Tudor Period').
1922. Eveline C. Martin ('The English establishments on the Gold Coast in the second half of the eighteenth century').

[1] No award was made in 1900, 1907, 1910, 1911, 1913, 1914, 1921, 1946, 1948, 1956. The prize Essays for 1909 and 1919 were not published in the *Transactions*. No Essays were submitted in 1915, 1916 and 1943.

1923. E. W. Hensman, M.A. ('The Civil War of 1648 in the east midlands').
1924. Grace Stretton, B.A. ('Some aspects of mediæval travel').
1925. F. A. Mace, M.A. ('Devonshire ports in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries').
1926. Marian J. Tooley, M.A. ('The authorship of the *Defensor Pacis*').
1927. W. A. Pantin, B.A. ('Chapters of the English Black Monks, 1215–1540').
1928. Gladys A. Thornton, B.A., Ph.D. ('A study in the history of Clare, Suffolk, with special reference to its development as a borough').
1929. F. S. Rodkey, A.M., Ph.D. ('Lord Palmerston's policy for the rejuvenation of Turkey, 1839–47').
1930. A. A. Ettinger, D.Phil. ('The proposed Anglo-Franco-American Treaty of 1852 to guarantee Cuba to Spain').
1931. Kathleen A. Walpole, M.A. ('The humanitarian movement of the early nineteenth century to remedy abuses on emigrant vessels to America').
1932. Dorothy M. Brodie, B.A. ('Edmund Dudley, minister of Henry VII').
1933. R. W. Southern, B.A. ('Ranulf Flambard and early Anglo-Norman administration').
1934. S. B. Chrimes, M.A., Ph.D. ('Sir John Fortescue and his theory of dominion').
1935. S. T. Bindoff, M.A. ('The unreformed diplomatic service, 1812–60').
1936. Rosamond J. Mitchell, M.A., B.Litt. ('English students at Padua, 1460–1475').
1937. C. H. Philips, B.A. ('The East India Company "Interest", and the English Government, 1783–4').
1938. H. E. I. Phillips, B.A. ('The last years of the Court of Star Chamber, 1630–41').
1939. Hilda P. Grieve, B.A. ('The deprived married clergy in Essex, 1553–61').
1940. R. Somerville, M.A. ('The Duchy of Lancaster Council and Court of Duchy Chamber').
1941. R. A. L. Smith, M.A., Ph.D. ('The *Regimen Scaccarii* in English monasteries').
1942. F. L. Carsten, D.Phil. ('Medieval democracy in the Brandenburg towns and its defeat in the fifteenth century').
1944. Rev. E. W. Kemp, B.D. ('Pope Alexander III and the canonization of saints').
1945. Helen Suggett, B.Litt. ('The use of French in England in the later middle ages').
1947. June Milne, B.A. ('The diplomacy of Dr. John Robinson at the court of Charles XII of Sweden, 1697–1709').
1949. Ethel Drus, M.A. ('The attitude of the Colonial Office to the annexation of Fiji').
1950. Doreen J. Milne, M.A., Ph.D. ('The results of the Rye House Plot, and their influence upon the Revolution of 1688').
1951. K. G. Davies, B.A. ('The origins of the commission system in the West India trade').

1952. G. W. S. Barrow, B.Litt. ('Scottish rulers and the religious orders, 1070–1153').
1953. W. E. Minchinton, B.Sc.(Econ.) ('Bristol—metropolis of the west in the eighteenth century').
1954. Rev. L. Boyle, O.P. ('The *Oculus Sacerdotis* and some other works of William of Pagula').
1955. G. F. E. Rudé, M.A., Ph.D. ('The Gordon riots: a study of the rioters and their victims').
1957. R. F. Hunnisett, M.A., D.Phil. ('The origins of the office of Coroner').
1958. Thomas G. Barnes, A.B., D.Phil. ('County politics and a puritan *cause célèbre:* Somerset churchales, 1633').

DAVID BERRY PRIZE

The David Berry Prize was established in 1929 by David Anderson-Berry in memory of his father, the Reverend David Berry. It consists of a gold medal and money prize awarded every three years for Scottish history. Candidates may select any subject dealing with Scottish history within the reigns of James I to James VI inclusive, provided such subject has been previously submitted to and approved by the Council of the Royal Historical Society. The essay must be a genuine work of original research not hitherto published, and one which has not been awarded any other prize. There is no limit to the length of the essay. It must be sent in on or before 31 October 1961.

LIST OF DAVID BERRY PRIZE ESSAYISTS (1937–1955)[1]

1937. G. Donaldson, M.A. ('The polity of the Scottish Reformed Church *c.* 1560–1580, and the rise of the Presbyterian movement').
1943. Rev. Prof. A. F. Scott Pearson, D.Th., D.Litt. ('Anglo-Scottish religious relations, 1400–1600').
1949. T. Bedford Franklin, M.A., F.R.S.E. ('Monastic agriculture in Scotland, 1440–1600').
1955. W. A. McNeill, M.A. ('"Estaytt" of the king's rents and pensions, 1621').

[1] No Essays were submitted in 1940. No awards were made in 1946 and 1952.

ROYAL HISTORICAL SOCIETY

(INCORPORATED BY ROYAL CHARTER.)

OFFICERS AND COUNCIL—1958

Patron

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

President

PROFESSOR THE REV. M. D. KNOWLES, Litt.D., D.Litt., F.B.A., F.S.A.

Honorary Vice-Presidents

PROFESSOR H. HALE BELLOT, M.A., LL.D.
THE RIGHT HON. SIR WINSTON CHURCHILL, K.G., O.M., C.H., M.P., F.R.S., F.B.A.
PROFESSOR J. G. EDWARDS, D.Litt., F.B.A.
SIR CYRIL FLOWER, C.B., M.A., F.B.A., F.S.A.
PROFESSOR V. H. GALBRAITH, D.Lit., Litt.D., F.B.A.
G. P. GOOCH, C.H., D.Litt., Litt.D., F.B.A.
THE RIGHT HON. THE EARL OF ILCHESTER, G.B.E., D.Litt., F.S.A.
CHARLES JOHNSON, C.B.E., M.A., F.B.A., F.S.A.
PROFESSOR SIR LEWIS NAMIER, D.Litt., F.B.A.
PROFESSOR SIR JOHN NEALE, D.Litt., F.B.A.
PROFESSOR T. F. T. PLUCKNETT, M.A., LL.B., F.B.A.
PROFESSOR SIR MAURICE POWICKE, LL.D., D.Litt., Litt.D., F.B.A.
PROFESSOR SIR FRANK STENTON, LL.D., D.Litt., Litt.D., F.B.A.
PROFESSOR R. H. TAWNEY, Litt.D., F.B.A.
PROFESSOR A. J. TOYNBEE, C.H., D.C.L., D.Litt., Litt.D., F.B.A.
G. M. TREVELYAN, O.M., C.B.E., D.C.L., LL.D., D.Litt., Litt.D., F.B.A.
PROFESSOR SIR CHARLES WEBSTER, K.C.M.G., D.Litt., Litt.D., F.B.A.

Vice-Presidents

PROFESSOR A. BROWNING, D.Litt., F.B.A.
PROFESSOR E. F. JACOB, D.Phil., F.B.A., F.S.A.
P. GRIERSON, M.A., F.S.A.
PROFESSOR R. A. HUMPHREYS, O.B.E., Ph.D.
PROFESSOR C. R. CHENEY, M.A., F.B.A.
D. L. EVANS, O.B.E., D.Litt.
PROFESSOR HELEN M. CAM, C.B.E., Litt.D., F.B.A.
PROFESSOR R. R. DARLINGTON, Ph.D., F.B.A., F.S.A.

Council

G. S. R. Kitson Clark, Litt.D.
Professor J. H. Le Patourel, D.Phil.
Professor R. B. Wernham, M.A.
Professor S. T. Bindoff, M.A.
Professor W. N. Medlicott, D.Lit.
Professor J. S. Roskell, D.Phil.
B. Schofield, Litt.D.
R. W. Southern, M.A.
Professor C. N. L. Brooke, M.A.
Professor E. M. Carus-Wilson, M.A.
R. H. C. Davis, M.A., F.S.A.
Professor D. B. Quinn, Ph.D.
Professor M. A. Thomson, D.Phil.
J. S. Bromley, M.A.
Professor H. A. Cronne, M.A.
Professor H. J. Habakkuk, M.A.
Professor J. M. Wallace-Hadrill, M.A.

Honorary Secretary

R. W. Greaves, D.Phil. [to 8 March 1958]
Alun Davies, M.A. [from 10 May 1958]

Literary Director

Professor D. Hay, M.A. [to 30 June 1958]
P. Chaplais, Ph.D. [from 1 July 1958]

Honorary Treasurer

T. F. Reddaway, M.A., F.S.A.

Secretary and Librarian

Miss A. M. Armstrong, B.A.

Library and Offices

96 Cheyne Walk, Chelsea, S.W.10

Bankers

Barclays Limited

STANDING COMMITTEES—1958

Finance Committee

Professor Helen M. Cam, C.B.E., Litt.D., F.B.A.
A. H. Cheney
Professor W. N. Medlicott, D.Lit.
Professor J. S. Roskell, D.Phil.
B. Schofield, Litt.D.
Professor the Rev. M. D. Knowles, Litt.D., D.Litt., F.B.A., F.S.A., *President*
Professor D. Hay, M.A., *Literary Director*
T. F. Reddaway, M.A., F.S.A., *Hon. Treasurer*
R. W. Greaves, D.Phil., *Hon. Secretary*

Publication and Library Committee

J. S. Bromley, M.A.
Professor C. R. Cheney, M.A., F.B.A.
D. L. Evans, O.B.E., D.Litt.
Professor E. F. Jacob, D.Phil., F.B.A., F.S.A.
Professor A. V. Judges, B.A., D.Sc.(Econ.)
Professor J. H. Le Patourel, D.Phil.
Professor W. N. Medlicott, D.Lit.
R. W. Southern, M.A.
Professor the Rev. M. D. Knowles, Litt.D., D.Litt., F.B.A., F.S.A.
Professor D. Hay, M.A., *Literary Director*
T. F. Reddaway, M.A., F.S.A., *Hon. Treasurer*
R. W. Greaves, D.Phil., *Hon. Secretary*

Bibliography (Annual) Committee

Professor A. Aspinall, D.Litt.
Professor H. Hale Bellot, M.A., LL.D.
R. B. Pugh, M.A., F.S.A.
Professor W. Rees, M.A., D.Sc.
Professor the Rev. M. D. Knowles, Litt.D., D.Litt., F.B.A., F.S.A., *President*
Professor D. Hay, M.A., *Literary Director*
T. F. Reddaway, M.A., F.S.A., *Hon. Treasurer*
R. W. Greaves, D.Phil., *Hon. Secretary*

Lists of Fellows, Associates, Subscribing Libraries, etc.

In future this will only be printed in *Transactions* every fourth year. For the lists complete to 31 December 1955 see *Transactions*, fifth series, vol. VI (1956), 205–242.

TRANSACTIONS AND PUBLICATIONS
OF THE
ROYAL HISTORICAL SOCIETY

The annual publications of the Society issued to Fellows and Subscribing Libraries include the *Transactions*, supplemented since 1897 by a continuation of the publications of the Camden Society (1838–1897) as the *Camden series*, and since 1937 by a series of *Guides and handbooks*. The Society has also issued from time to time certain miscellaneous publications, has published since 1937 an annual bibliography of *Writings on British history*, and is publishing in conjunction with the American Historical Association a series of *Bibliographies of British history*. Additional copies of the *Transactions*, the *Camden series*, the *Guides and handbooks*, and the 'Miscellaneous publications' may be obtained by Fellows and Subscribing Libraries at the prices stated below. The series of annual bibliographies of *Writings on British history* and the *Bibliographies of British history* are not included among the volumes issued to subscribers, but may be obtained by them through the Society, at the special prices stated below, upon application to the Secretary, Royal Historical Society, 96 Cheyne Walk, S.W.10. Associates, while receiving only the *Transactions* in return for their subscription, are entitled to purchase at a reduction of 25 per cent one copy of other volumes issued to Fellows and Subscribing Libraries and one copy of each of the volumes of the *Writings on British history* and the *Bibliographies of British history* at the special price.

The *Transactions* and the *Camden series* are not available on sale to the public. Copies of the 'Miscellaneous publications' and of *Guides and handbooks* may be had at the stated prices on application to the Secretary, or through the booksellers. The *Writings* and the *Bibliographies of British history* may be obtained from the publishers or through the booksellers.

TRANSACTIONS*

Old series, 1872–1882. Vols. I to X.
New series, 1884–1906. Vols. I to XX.
Third series, 1907–1917. Vols. I to XI.
Fourth series, 1918–1950. Vols. I to XXXII.
Fifth series, 1951– . Vols. I–VIII.

MISCELLANEOUS PUBLICATIONS

†Domesday commemoration. Notes on the manuscripts, etc., exhibited at the Public Record Office. 1886. 6s. 6d.

* Vols. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 9 and 10 of the Old series, vols. 1, 3 and 10 of the New series and vol. 9 of the Third series are out of print. New series vols. 2 and 19 and Fourth series vols. 1 and 4 are only supplied by special leave of the Council. Others are supplied at 15s. each volume. The earliest volumes of the *Transactions* were issued to Fellows in unbound parts. Any discrepancies in the lettering of bound volumes during these periods are doubtless due to this.

† Out of print.

Domesday studies. 2 vols. Edited by P. E. Dove. 1886. 32s.

†England and Napoleon in 1803: being the despatches of Lord Whitworth and others. Edited by Oscar Browning. 1887. 10s.

Walter of Henley's Husbandry, together with an anonymous Husbandry, Seneschaucie, and Robert Grosseteste's Rules. Edited by Elizabeth Lamond and the Rev. W. Cunningham. 1890. 16s.

Proceedings of the Gibbon commemoration 1794–1894. 1895. 6s. 6d.

The Domesday of Inclosures, 1517–18. Edited by I. S. Leadam. 2 vols. 1897. 40s.

†A bibliography of the historical works of Mandell Creighton, William Stubbs, S. R. Gardiner and John, Lord Acton. Edited by W. A. Shaw. 1903. 6s. 6d.

German opinion and German policy before the War. By G. W. Prothero. 1916. 5s. 6d.

Magna Carta commemoration essays. With preface by the Right Hon. Viscount Bryce. Edited by H. E. Malden. 1917. 33s. 6d.

*A repertory of British archives. Part I. England. Compiled by Hubert Hall. 1920. 10s. 6d.

*A list and index of the Transactions and publications of the Royal Historical Society (1869–1924) and of the publications of the Camden Society (1840–1897). Edited by Hubert Hall. 1925. 5s.

The *Domesday monachorum* of Christ Church, Canterbury. 1944. 30s.

BIBLIOGRAPHIES ISSUED IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

Bibliography of British history: Tudor period, 1485–1603. Edited by Conyers Read. 1933. Oxford Univ. Press, 35s. (Special price, 24s.) (Out of print.)

Bibliography of British history: Stuart period, 1603–1714. Edited by Godfrey Davies. 1928. Oxford Univ. Press, 25s. (Special price, 19s. 6d.) (Out of print.)

Bibliography of British history: 1714–1789. Edited by S. M. Pargellis and D. J. Medley. 1951. Oxford Univ. Press, 42s. (Special price, 32s. 6d.)

ANNUAL BIBLIOGRAPHIES

Writings on British history, 1934. Compiled by A. T. Milne. 1937. London, Jonathan Cape, 21s. (Special price, 18s.)

Writings on British history, 1935. Compiled by A. T. Milne. 1939. London, Jonathan Cape, 21s. (Special price, 18s.)

Writings on British history, 1936. Compiled by A. T. Milne. 1940. London, Jonathan Cape, 12s. 6d. (Special price, 10s.)

Writings on British history, 1937. Compiled by A. T. Milne. 1949. London, Jonathan Cape, 21s. (Special price, 18s.)

Writings on British history, 1938. Compiled by A. T. Milne. 1951. London, Jonathan Cape, 21s. (Special price, 18s.)

Writings on British history, 1939. Compiled by A. T. Milne. 1953. London, Jonathan Cape, 21s. (Special price, 18s.)

Writings on British history, 1940–1945. 2 vols. Compiled by A. T. Milne. (*In the press.*)

GUIDES AND HANDBOOKS

1. Guide to English commercial statistics, 1696–1782. By G. N. Clark, with a catalogue of materials by Barbara M. Franks. 1938. 7s. 6d.

* Supplied only by special leave of Council. † Out of print.

†2. Handbook of British chronology. Edited by F. M. Powicke, with the assistance of Charles Johnson and W. J. Harte. 1939. 7s. 6d.
†3. Medieval libraries of Great Britain, an index of surviving books. Edited by N. R. Ker. 1941. 7s. 6d.
4. Handbook of dates for students of English history. By C. R. Cheney. 1955. 12s. 6d.
5. Guide to the national and provincial directories of England and Wales, excluding London, published before 1856. By Jane E. Norton. 1950. 18s.
6. Handbook of Oriental History. Edited by C. H. Philips. 1951. 18s.
7. Texts and calendars: an analytical guide to serial publications. Edited by E. L. C. Mullins. 1958. 50s.

Provisionally accepted for future publication:

List and index of parliamentary papers, 1700–1800. Edited by E. Wagstaff and A. T. Milne.

† Out of print; a revised edition is in progress.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE LATE CAMDEN SOCIETY

CONTINUED (FROM 1897) AS THE CAMDEN SERIES OF THE ROYAL HISTORICAL SOCIETY

OLD SERIES*

*1. Historie of the arrivall of Edward IV in England and the final recoverye of his kingdomes from Henry VI (1471). Edited by J. Bruce. 1838.

*2. Kynge Johan. A play in two parts. By John Bale. Edited by J. P. Collier. 1838.

*3. Alliterative poem on the deposition of Richard II; Ricardi Maydiston de Concordia inter Ric. II et civitatem London. Edited by T. Wright. 1838.

†4. Plumpton correspondence. Letters written in the reigns of Edward IV, Richard III, Henry VII, and Henry VIII. Edited by T. Stapleton. 1839.

*5. Anecdotes and traditions, illustrative of early English history and literature. Edited by W. J. Thoms. 1839.

†6. The political songs of England, from the reign of John to Edward II. Edited and translated by T. Wright. 1839.

*7. Annals of the first four years of the reign of Queen Elizabeth, by Sir J. Hayward. Edited by J. Bruce. 1840.

8. Ecclesiastical documents: 1. A brief history of the bishoprick of Somerset from its foundation to 1174. 2. Charters from the library of Dr. Cox Macro. Published by the Rev. J. Hunter. 1840.

9. Speculi Britanniæ Pars: an historical and geographical description of the county of Essex, by John Norden, 1594. Edited by Sir H. Ellis. 1840.

*10. A Chronicle of the first thirteen years of the reign of Edward IV, by John Warkworth, D.D. Edited by J. O. Halliwell. 1839.

*11. Kemp's nine daies wonder: performed in a daunce from London to Norwich. Edited by Rev. A. Dyce. 1840.

*12. The Egerton papers, temp. Elizabeth and James I. Edited by J. P. Collier. 1840.

*13. Chronica Jocelini de Brakelonda, de rebus gestis Samsonis abbatis monasterii Sancti Edmundi. Edited by J. G. Rokewode. 1840.

*14. Narratives illustrative of the contests in Ireland in 1641 and 1690. Edited by T. C. Croker. 1841.

15. The chronicle of William de Rishanger, of the Barons' Wars. The miracles of Simon de Montfort. Edited by J. O. Halliwell. 1840.

*Of volumes marked with an asterisk but a few copies remain, and these are only supplied by special leave of the Council. Others may be had at the following prices: Old series, from 20s.; New series and Third series, from 15s. (*British diplomatic instructions*, 22s. 6d. each).

† Volumes marked with a dagger are out of print.

†16. The Latin poems commonly attributed to Walter Mapes. Edited by T. Wright. 1841.

17. The second book of the travels of Nicander Nucius, of Corcyra. Edited by Rev. J. A. Cramer. 1841.

18. Three early English metrical romances. Edited by J. Robson. 1842.

*19. The private diary of Dr. John Dee, and the catalogue of his library of manuscripts. Edited by J. O. Halliwell. 1842.

*20. An apology for Lollard doctrines, attributed to Wicliffe. Edited by J. H. Todd. 1842.

21. Rutland papers. Original documents illustrative of the courts and times of Henry VII and Henry VIII. Edited by W. Jerdan. 1842.

22. The diary of Dr. Thomas Cartwright, bishop of Chester, from August 1686 to October 1687. Edited by the Rev. J. Hunter. 1843.

23. Original letters of eminent literary men of the sixteenth, seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Edited by Sir H. Ellis. 1843.

24. A contemporary narrative of the proceedings against Dame Alice Kyteler, prosecuted for sorcery in 1324, by Richard de Ledrede, bishop of Ossory. Edited by T. Wright. 1843.

25. Promptorium parvulorum sive clericorum, Lexicon anglo-latinum princeps, auctore fratre Galfrido Grammatico dicto, e Predicatoribus Lenne Episcopi, Northfolciensi, A.D. *c.* 1440. Vol. I. Edited by A. Way. 1843. (*See* nos. 54 and 89.)

*26. Three chapters of letters relating to the suppression of monasteries. Edited by T. Wright. 1843.

27. Correspondence of Robert Dudley, earl of Leycester, during his government of the Low Countries 1585 and 1586. Edited by J. Bruce. 1844.

28. Croniques de London, depuis l'an 44 Hen. III jusqu'à l'an 17 Edw. III. Edited by G. J. Aungier. 1844.

*29. Three books of Polydore Vergil's English history, comprising the reigns of Henry VI, Edward IV and Richard III. Edited by Sir H. Ellis. 1844. (*See* no. 36 and Third series, no. 74.)

30. The Thornton romances. The early English metrical romances of Perceval, Isumbras, Eglamour, and Degrevant. Edited by J. O. Halliwell. 1844.

31. Verney papers. Notes of proceedings in the Long Parliament, temp. Charles I. Edited by J. Bruce. 1845.

32. The autobiography of Sir John Bramston, K.B., of Skreens, in the hundred of Chelmsford. 1845.

33. Letters from James, earl of Perth, Lord Chancellor of Scotland, etc., to his sister the countess of Erroll, and other members of his family. Edited by W. Jerdan. 1845.

34. De antiquis legibus liber. Cronica maiorum et vicecomitum Londoniarum 1178–1274. By T. Stapleton. 1846.

35. The chronicle of Calais, in the reigns of Henry VII and Henry VIII, to 1540. Edited by J. G. Nichols. 1846.

36. Polydore Vergil's English history, prior to the Norman Conquest. Edited by Sir H. Ellis. 1846. (*See* no. 29 and Third series, no. 74.)

37. A relation, or rather a true account, of the isle of England, about 1500. Translated from the Italian by Charlotte Augusta Sneyd. 1847.

38. Documents relative to the foundation and antiquities of the collegiate church of Middleham, co. York, and incidental notices of the castle, neighbourhood and town. Edited by Rev. W. Atthill. 1847.

39. The Camden miscellany, Vol. I: 1. Register and chronicle of the abbey of Aberconway. Edited by Sir H. Ellis. 2. Chronicle of the rebellion in Lincolnshire in 1470. Edited by J. G. Nichols. 3. Bull of Pope Innocent VIII, on the marriage of Henry VII with Elizabeth of York. Communicated by J. P. Collier. 4. Journal of the siege of Rouen in 1591. By Sir T. Coningsby. Edited by J. G. Nichols. 5. Letter from George Fleetwood to his father, giving an account of the battle of Lutzen and the death of Gustavus Adolphus. Edited by Sir P. de Malpas Grey Egerton, Bart. 6. Diary of Dr. Edward Lake, archdeacon and prebendary of Exeter, etc., in 1677 and 1678. Edited by G. P. Elliott. 1847.

40. A commentary of the services and charges of William Lord Grey of Wilton, by his son Arthur Lord Grey of Wilton. Edited by Sir P. de Malpas Grey Egerton, Bart. 1847.

41. Diary of Walter Yonge, Justice of the Peace, and M.P. for Honiton, 1604 to 1628. Edited by G. Roberts. 1848.

42. The diary of Henry Machyn, citizen and Merchant Taylor of London, from 1550 to 1563. Edited by J. G. Nichols. 1848.

43. The visitation of the county of Huntingdon under the authority of William Camden, Clarenceux King of Arms, by his deputy Nicholas Charles, Lancaster Herald, 1613. Edited by Sir H. Ellis. 1849.

44. The obituary of Richard Smyth, secondary of the poultry Compter. London, 1627 to 1674. Edited by Sir H. Ellis. 1849.

45. Certaine considerations upon the government of England. By Sir Roger Twysden. Edited by J. M. Kemble. 1849.

46. Letters of Queen Elizabeth and James VI of Scotland. Edited by J. Bruce. 1849.

47. Chronicon Petroburgense. Edited by T. Stapleton. 1849.

48. The chronicle of Queen Jane, and of two years of Queen Mary and especially of the rebellion of Sir Thomas Wyat. Edited by J. G. Nichols. 1850.

49. Wills and inventories, from the registers of the commissary of Bury St. Edmunds and the archdeacon of Sudbury. Edited by S. Tymms. 1850.

50. Gualteri Mapes de nugis curialium distinctiones quinque. Edited by T. Wright. 1850.

51. The pylgrymage of Sir Richard Guylforde to the Holy Land, 1506. Edited by Sir H. Ellis. 1851.

52. Moneys received and paid for secret services of Charles II and James II, 1679 to 1688. Edited by J. Y. Akerman. 1851.

†53. Chronicle of the Grey Friars of London. Edited by J. G. Nichols. 1852.

54. Promptorium parvulorum, Vol. II. Edited by A. Way. 1853. (*See* nos. 25 and 89.)

†55. The Camden miscellany, Vol. II: 1. Account of the expenses of John of Brabant and Henry and Thomas of Lancaster, 1292–3. Edited by J. Burtt. 2. Household expenses of the Princess Elizabeth at Hatfield, 1551–2. Edited by Viscount Strangford. 3. The request and suite of a true-hearted Englishman written by William Cholmeley, Londyner, in 1553. Edited by W. J. Thoms. 4. The discovery of the Jesuits' College at

Clerkenwell in March, 1627–8, and a letter found in their house. Edited by J. G. Nichols. 5. Trelawny papers. Edited by W. D. Cooper. 6. Autobiography and anecdotes, by William Taswell. Edited by G. P. Elliott. 1853.

†56. Letters and papers of the Verney family, to the end of 1639. Edited by J. Bruce. 1853.

†57. The Ancren Riwle. A treatise on the rules and duties of monastic life. Edited by J. Morton. 1853.

58. Letters of the Lady Brilliana Harley. Edited by T. T. Lewis. 1853.

†59. A roll of the household expenses of Richard de Swinfield, bishop of Hereford, 1289–90. Vol. I. Edited by the Rev. J. Webb. 1853. (*See* no. 62.)

60. Grants, etc., from the Crown during the reign of Edward V and two speeches for opening parliament, by John Russell, bishop of Lincoln, Lord Chancellor. Edited by J. G. Nichols. 1854.

61. The Camden miscellany, Vol. III: 1. Papers relating to proceedings in co. Kent, 1642–1646. Edited by R. Almack. 2. Ancient biographical poems, on the duke of Norfolk, Viscount Hereford, the earls of Essex, and Queen Elizabeth. Edited by J. P. Collier. 3. A relation of some abuses which are committed against the Commonwealth, 1629. Edited by Sir F. Madden. 4. Inventories of the wardrobes, plate, chapel stuff, etc., of Henry FitzRoy, duke of Richmond, and of Katherine, Princess Dowager. Edited by J. G. Nichols. 1855.

62. A roll of the household expenses of Richard de Swinfield, bishop of Hereford. Vol. II. Edited by the Rev. J. Webb. 1855. (*See* no. 59.)

63. Charles I in 1646: Letters of Charles I to Queen Henrietta Maria. Edited by J. Bruce. 1856.

*64. An English chronicle of the reigns of Richard II, Henry IV, Henry V and Henry VI written before 1471. Edited by the Rev. J. S. Davies. 1856.

*65. The Knights Hospitallers in England, 1338. Edited by the Rev. L. B. Larking. 1857.

66. Diary of John Rous, incumbent of Santon Downham, Suffolk, from 1625 to 1642. Edited by Mary Anne E. Green. 1856.

67. Trevelyan papers prior to 1558. Part I. Edited by J. P. Collier. 1857. (*See* nos. 84 and 105.)

68. Journal of the Very Rev. Rowland Davies, dean of Ross 1688–1690. Edited by R. Caulfield. 1857.

†69. The Domesday of St. Paul's, 1222; or Registrum de visitatione maneriorum per Robertum decanum, and other original documents relating to the manors and churches belonging to the dean and chapter of St. Paul's London in the 12th and 13th centuries. Edited by W. H. Hale. 1858.

*70. Liber famelicus of James Whitelocke, a judge of the King's Bench in the reigns of James I and Charles I. Edited by J. Bruce. 1858.

*71. Savile correspondence, temp. Charles II and James II. Edited by W. D. Cooper. 1858.

72. The Romance of Blonde of Oxford and Jehan of Dammartin. By Philippe de Reimes, a trouvère of the thirteenth century. Edited by A. J. V. Le Roux de Lincy. 1858.

†73. The Camden miscellany, Vol. IV: 1. A London chronicle during the reigns of Henry VII and Henry VIII. Edited by C. Hopper. 2. The expenses of the Judges of Assize riding in the western and Oxford circuits, 1596–1601. Edited by W. D. Cooper. 3. The skryvener's play, the incredulity of St. Thomas. Edited by J. P. Collier. 4. The Childe of Bristowe, a poem by John Lydgate. Edited by C. Hopper. 5. Sir Edward Lake's account of his interviews with Charles I on being created a baronet. Edited by T. P. Langmead. 6. The letters of Pope to Atterbury, when in the Tower of London. Edited by J. G. Nichols. 7. Supplementary note to the Jesuits' College at Clerkenwell in March 1627–8. Edited by J. G. Nichols. 1859.

†74. Diary of the marches of the royal army during the great Civil War, kept by Richard Symonds. Edited by C. E. Long. 1859.

†75. Original papers illustrative of the life and writings of John Milton. Edited by W. D. Hamilton. 1859.

*76. Letters of George Lord Carew to Sir Thomas Roe, ambassador to the court of the Great Mogul, 1615–1617. Edited by J. Maclean. 1860.

*77. Narratives of the days of the Reformation chiefly from the MSS. of John Foxe, the martyrologist; with two contemporary biographies of Archbishop Cranmer. Edited by J. G. Nichols. 1859.

†78. Correspondence of James VI of Scotland with Sir Robert Cecil and others in England, temp. Elizabeth. Edited by J. Bruce. 1861.

*79. Letters written by John Chamberlain during the reign of Queen Elizabeth. Edited by Sarah Williams. 1861.

*80. Proceedings, principally in co. Kent, in connection with the Parliaments called in 1640. Edited by Rev. L. B. Larking. 1862.

*81. Parliamentary debates in 1610. Edited by S. R. Gardiner. 1862.

†82. Lists of foreign protestants, and aliens, resident in England—1618–1688. Edited by W. D. Cooper. 1862.

83. Wills from Doctors' Commons. A selection from the wills of eminent persons proved in the Prerogative Court of Canterbury. 1495–1695. Edited by J. G. Nichols. 1863.

†84. Trevelyan papers. Part II. 1446–1643. Edited by J. P. Collier. 1863. (*See* nos. 67 and 105.)

*85. The life of Marmaduke Rawdon of York. Edited by R. Davies. 1863.

*86. Letters of Queen Margaret of Anjou and Bishop Beckington, and others, temp. Henry V and Henry VI. Edited by C. Munro. 1863.

†87. The Camden miscellany, Vol. V: 1. Five letters of Charles II. Communicated by the marquis of Bristol. 2. Letter of the Council to Sir Thomas Lake, relating to the proceedings of Sir Edward Coke at Oatlands. 3. Documents relating to Sir Walter Raleigh's last voyage. Communicated by S. R. Gardiner. 4. A catalogue of early English miscellanies formerly in the Harleian Library. Edited by W. C. Hazlitt. 5. Letters selected from the collection of autographs in the possession of William Tite, Esq. 6. Sir Francis Drake's memorable service done against the Spaniards in 1587, written by Robert Leng, one of his co-adventurers. Edited by C. Hopper. 7. Inquiry into the genuineness of a letter dated February 3rd, 1613, signed 'Mary Magdaline Davers.' 1864.

†88. Letters from Sir Robert Cecil to Sir George Carew. Edited by J. Maclean. 1864.

†89. Promptorium parvulorum. Vol. III. Edited by A. Way. 1865. (*See* nos. 25 and 54.)

†90. Letters and other documents illustrating the relations between England and Germany at the commencement of the Thirty Years' War. Edited by S. R. Gardiner. 1865. (*See* no. 98.)

†91. Registrum sive liber irrotularius et consuetudinarius prioratus Beatae Mariae Wigorniensis. Edited by W. H. Hale. 1865.

92. Pope Alexander VII and the college of Cardinals. By John Bargrave, canon of Canterbury [1662–1680] with a catalogue of Dr. Bargrave's Museum. Edited by J. C. Robertson. 1867.

†93. Accounts and papers relating to Mary, queen of Scots. Edited by A. J. Crosby and J. Bruce. 1867.

†94. History from marble. Compiled in the reign of Charles II by Thomas Dingley. Printed in photolithography by Vincent Brooks. Vol. I. Edited by J. G. Nichols. 1867. (*See* no. 97.)

†95. Manipulus vocabulorum. A dictionary of English and Latin words by Peter Levins, 1570. First printed 1570. Re-edited by H. B. Wheatley. 1867.

*96. Journal of a voyage into the Mediterranean, by Sir Kenelm Digby, 1628. Edited by J. Bruce. 1868.

†97. History from marble. Vol. II. Edited by J. G. Nichols. 1868. (*See* no. 94.)

†98. Letters and other documents illustrating the relations between England and Germany at the commencement of the Thirty Years' War, from the election of the Emperor Ferdinand II to the close of the conferences of Mühlhausen. Edited by S. R. Gardiner. 1868. (*See* no. 90.)

†99. Diary of John Manningham, of the Middle Temple and of Bradbourne, Kent, barrister-at-law, 1602–3. Edited by W. Tite. 1868.

†100. Notes of the treaty carried on at Ripon between Charles I and the Covenanters of Scotland, 1640, taken by Sir John Borough, Garter King of Arms. Edited by J. Bruce. 1869.

*101. El hecho de los tratados del matrimonio pretendido por el Principe de Gales con la serenissima Infante de España Maria, tomado desde sus principios para major demostracion de la verdad, y ajustado con los papeles originales desde consta. Por el maestro F. Francisco de Jesus. Narrative of the Spanish marriage treaty. Edited and translated by S. R. Gardiner. 1869.

†102. Churchwardens' accounts of the town of Ludlow, in Shropshire from 1540 to the end of the reign of Queen Elizabeth. Edited by T. Wright. 1869.

†103. Notes of the debates in the House of Lords, officially taken by Henry Elsing, Clerk of the Parliaments, 1621. Edited by S. R. Gardiner.

†104. The Camden miscellany, Vol. VI: 1. Life of William Whittingham, dean of Durham, with an appendix of original documents from the Record Office. Edited by Mary Anne E. Greene. 2. The Earl of Bristol's defence of his negotiations in Spain. Edited by S. R. Gardiner. Journal of Sir Francis Walsingham, December 1570 to April 1583. Edited by C. T. Martin. 1870.

†105. Trevelyan papers. Part III, 1446–1643. Edited by Sir Walter and Sir Charles Trevelyan. 1872. (*See* nos. 67 and 84.)

NEW SERIES

Vol. 56 onwards were issued after the amalgamation of the two Societies.

†1. The Fortescue papers; chiefly consisting of letters relating to state affairs, collected by John Packer, secretary to George Villiers, duke of Buckingham. Edited by S. R. Gardiner. 1871.

†2. Letters and papers of John Shillingford, mayor of Exeter, 1447–50. Edited by Stuart A. Moore. 1871.

†3. The old cheque book of the Chapel Royal from 1561 to 1744. Edited by E. F. Rimbault. 1872.

†4. A true relation of the life and death of the Right Rev. William Bedell, lord bishop of Kilmore in Ireland. Edited by T. W. Jones. 1872.

†5. The maire of bristowe is kalendar, by Robert Ricart, town clerk of Bristol, 18 Edward IV. Edited by Lucy Toulmin Smith. 1872.

*6. Debates in the House of Commons in 1625. Edited by S. R. Gardiner. 1873.

†7. Military memoir of Colonel Birch, governor of Hereford during the Civil War; written by Roe, his secretary. Edited by the Rev. John Webb and the Rev. T. W. Webb. 1873.

8 and 9. Letters addressed from London to Sir Joseph Williamson while plenipotentiary at the congress of Cologne in the years 1673 and 1674. Edited by W. D. Christie. 1874. Two vols.

*10. Account of the executors of Richard, bishop of London, 1303, and of the executors of Thomas, bishop of Exeter, 1310. Edited by the Venerable W. H. Hale and the Rev. H. T. Ellacombe. 1874.

*11. A chronicle of England during the reigns of the Tudors, from 1485 to 1559, by Charles Wriothesley, Windsor Herald. Edited by W. D. Hamilton, Vol. I. 1875. (*See* no. 20.)

12. The quarrel between the earl of Manchester and Oliver Cromwell; An episode of the English Civil War. Historical preface by J. Bruce. Annotated and completed by D. Masson. 1875.

†13. Autobiography of Anne, Lady Halkett. Edited by J. G. Nichols. 1875.

†14. The Camden miscellany, Vol. VII: 1. Two sermons preached by the Boy-Bishop, one at St. Paul's, temp. Henry VIII, the other at Gloucester, temp. Mary. Edited by J. G. Nichols. 2. Speech of Sir Robert Heath, Attorney-General, in the case of Alexander Leighton in the Star Chamber, 4 June 1630. Edited by S. R. Gardiner. 3. Notes of Sir G. Croke's judgment in the case of Ship Money. Edited by S. R. Gardiner. 4. Letters relating to the mission of Sir Thomas Roe to Gustavus Adolphus, 1629–1630. Edited by S. R. Gardiner. 5. Receipts and expenses in building Bodmin church, 1469–1472. Edited by the Rev. J. J. Wilkinson. 1875.

15. Letters of Humphrey Prideaux, dean of Norwich, to John Ellis, Under Secretary of State 1674–1722. Edited by E. Maunde Thompson. 1875.

†16. A common place book of John Milton, and a Latin essay and Latin verse, presumed to be by Milton. Edited by A. J. Horwood. 1876.

†17. Historical collections of a London citizen in the fifteenth century, containing (i) John Page's poem on the siege of Rouen, (ii) Lydgate's verses on the king of England, (iii) William Gregory's chronicle of London. Edited by James Gairdner. 1876.

*18. Documents relating to the proceedings against William Prynne. Biographical preface by J. Bruce. Edited by S. R. Gardiner. 1877.

19. Christ Church letters relating to the priory of Christ Church, Canterbury. Edited by J. B. Sheppard. 1877.

†20. Wriothesley's chronicle. Vol. II. Edited by W. D. Hamilton. 1878. (*See* no. 11.)

*21. A treatise of the pretended divorce between Henry VIII and Catherine of Aragon, by Nicholas Harpsfield, archdeacon of Canterbury. Edited by N. Pocock. 1878.

*22. Correspondence of the family of Hatton, 1601–1704. Vol. I. Edited by E. Maunde Thompson. 1878. (*See* no. 23.)

*23. Correspondence of the family of Hatton, 1601–1704. Vol. II. Edited by E. Maunde Thompson. 1878. (*See* no. 22.)

*24. Notes of the debates in the House of Lords officially taken by Henry Elsing, Clerk of the Parliaments, 1624 and 1626. Edited by S. R. Gardiner. 1879. (*See* Third series, no. 42.)

25. The Œconomy of the Fleete: or an apologeticall answeare of Alexander Harris (late warden) unto XIX articles sett forth against him by the prisoners. Edited by the Rev. Augustus Jessopp. 1879.

*26. Documents relating to St. Paul's Cathedral. Edited by the Rev. W. Sparrow Simpson. 1880.

*27. The Hamilton papers; selections from original letters in the possession of the duke of Hamilton and Brandon, 1638–1648. Edited by S. R. Gardiner. 1880.

†28. Three fifteenth-century chronicles, with historical memoranda and contemporary notes of occurrences by John Stowe. Edited by James Gairdner. 1880.

*29. The registers of the visitors of the university of Oxford, 1647 to 1658. Edited by Montagu Burrows. 1881.

†30. Catholicon anglicum, an English-Latin wordbook, dated 1483. Edited by Sidney J. H. Herrtage. 1882.

†31. The Camden miscellany, Vol. VIII: 1. Four letters of Lord Wentworth, earl of Strafford, with a poem on his illness. Edited by S. R. Gardiner. 2. Memoire by Madame de Motteville on the life of Henrietta Maria. Edited by G. Hanotaux. 3. Papers relating to the delinquency of Lord Saville, 1642–1646. Edited by J. J. Cartwright. 4. A secret negotiation with Charles I, 1643–1644. Edited by Bertha M. Gardiner. 5. A letter from the earl of Manchester to the House of Lords, giving an opinion on the conduct of Oliver Cromwell. Edited by S. R. Gardiner. 6. Letters addressed to the earl of Lauderdale. Edited by O. Airy. 7. Original letters of the duke of Monmouth, in the Bodleian Library. Edited by Sir George Duckett, Bart. 8. Correspondence of the family of Haddock, 1657–1719. Edited by E. Maunde Thompson. 9. Letters of Richard Thompson to Henry Thompson of Escrick, co. York. Edited by J. J. Cartwright. 1883.

†32. The voyage to Cadiz in 1625, being a journal written by John Glanville, secretary to the Lord Admiral of the fleet. Edited by the Rev. A. B. Grosart. 1883.

†33. Letter book of Gabriel Harvey, 1573–1580. Edited by Edward J. L. Scott. 1884.

†34. The Lauderdale papers, temp. Car. II. Vol. I. 1639–1667. Edited by O. Airy. 1884. (*See* nos. 36 and 38.)

†35. Political memoranda of Francis, fifth duke of Leeds. Edited by Oscar Browning. 1884.

*36. The Lauderdale papers. Vol. II. 1667–73. Edited by O. Airy. 1885. (*See* nos. 34 and 38.)

†37. Troubles connected with the Prayer Book of 1540. Edited by N. Pocock. 1884.

†38. The Lauderdale papers. Vol. III. 1673–79. Edited by O. Airy. 1885. (*See* nos. 34 and 36.)

†39. Reports of cases in the courts of Star Chamber and High Commission. Edited by S. R. Gardiner. 1886.

†40. The Nicholas papers: Correspondence of Sir Edward Nicholas, Secretary of State. Vol. I. 1641–1652. Edited by G. F. Warner, 1886. (*See* nos. 50, 57, and Third series, No. 31.)

†41. Custumals of Battle Abbey, 1283–1312. Edited by S. R. Scargill Bird. 1887.

†42. The travels through England of Dr. Richard Pococke, successively Bishop of Meath and Ossory during 1750, 1751 and later years. Edited by J. J. Cartwright. Vol. I. 1888. (*See* no. 44.)

†43. Visitations of the diocese of Norwich, 1492–1532. Edited by the Rev. Augustus Jessopp. 1888.

†44. The travels through England of Bishop Pococke. Vol. II. Edited by J. J. Cartwright. 1889. (*See* no. 42.)

†45. Documents relating to the impeachment of the duke of Buckingham in 1626. Edited by S. R. Gardiner. 1889.

†46. Memoirs relating to Lord Torrington. Edited by J. K. Laughton. 1889.

*47. Essex Papers. Vol. I. Edited by O. Airy. 1890. (*See* Third series, no. 24.)

†48. Visitations and memorials of Southwell Minster. Edited by A. F. Leach. 1891.

†49. The Clarke papers. Selections from the papers of William Clarke, 1647–1660. Vol. I. Edited by C. H. Firth. 1891. (*See* nos. 54, 61 and 62.)

†50. The Nicholas papers. Vol. II. Jan. 1653–June 1655. Edited by G. F. Warner. 1892. (*See* nos. 40, 57, and Third series, no. 31.)

†51. Accounts of the obedientiars of Abingdon Abbey. Edited by R. E. G. Kirk. 1892.

†52. Expeditions to Prussia and the Holy Land made by Henry, earl of Derby (afterwards Henry IV): Accounts kept by his treasurer during the years 1390–1 and 1392–3. Edited by Lucy Toulmin Smith. 1894.

53. The Camden miscellany, Vol. IX: 1. Visitations of churches belonging to St. Paul's Cathedral,1249–1252. Edited by the Rev. W. Sparrow Simpson. 2. 'The Spousells' of the Princess Mary, daughter of Henry VII, to Charles, prince of Castile, in 1508. Edited by J. Gairdner. 3. Original letters from the bishops to the Privy Council in 1564. Edited by Mary Bateson. 4. Papers relating to Thomas Wentworth, first earl of Strafford. Edited by C. H. Firth. 5. Hamilton papers, Addenda. Edited by S. R. Gardiner. 6. Memoirs of Nathaniel, Lord Crewe. Edited by the Rev. Andrew Clark. 7. The journal of Major Richard Ferrier, M.P., during a tour in France in 1687. Edited by R. F. E. and J. A. H. Ferrier. 1895.

†54. The Clarke Papers. Vol. II. Edited by C. H. Firth. 1894. (*See* nos. 49, 61 and 62.)

55. Visitations of churches belonging to St. Paul's Cathedral in 1297 and in 1485. Edited by W. Sparrow Simpson. 1895.

56. The Archpriest controversy. Documents relating to the dissensions of the Roman Catholic clergy, 1597–1602. Vol. I. Edited by T. G. Law. 1896. (*See* no. 58.)

*57. The Nicholas papers. Vol. III. July 1655–Dec. 1656. Edited by G. F. Warner. 1897. (*See* nos. 40 and 50, and Third series, no. 31.)

58. The Archpriest controversy. Vol. II. Edited by T. G. Law. 1898. (*See* no. 56.)

59. A narrative of the changes in the ministry told by the duke of Newcastle in a series of letters to John White, M.P. 1765–1767. Edited by Mary Bateson. 1898.

60. The narrative of General Venables, with an appendix of papers relating to the Jamaica expedition, 1655. Edited by C. H. Firth. 1900.

61. The Clarke Papers. Vol. III. Edited by C. H. Firth. 1899. (*See* nos. 49, 54 and 62.)

62. The Clarke Papers. Vol. IV. Edited by C. H. Firth. 1901. (*See* nos. 49 54 and 61.)

THIRD SERIES

1. The Cely papers: Correspondence and memoranda of the Cely family merchants of the Staple in London and Calais, 1477–1488. Edited by H. E. Malden. 1900.

2. The despatches and correspondence of John, earl of Buckinghamshire, Ambassador to the court of Catherine II of Russia, 1762–1765. Edited by Adelaide d'Arcy Collyer. Vol. I. 1900. (*See* no. 3.)

3. The earl of Buckinghamshire's correspondence. Vol. II. Edited by Adelaide d'Arcy Collyer. 1902. (*See* no. 2.)

4. The Camden miscellany, Vol. X: 1. The journal of Sir Roger Wilbraham, Solicitor-General in Ireland and Master of Requests, 1593–1616, together with notes in another hand, 1642–1644. Edited by H. Spencer Scott. 2. The travels and life of Sir Philip Hoby, of Bisham Abbey, written by himself, 1547–1564. Edited by Edgar Powell. 3. Prince Rupert at Lisbon. Edited by S. R. Gardiner. 1902.

5. The despatches of William Perwich, English agent in Paris, 1669–1677. Edited by M. Beryl Curran. 1903.

6. Collectanea Anglo-Premonstratensia. Vol. I. Edited by the Right Rev. F. A. Gasquet. 1904. (*See* nos. 10 and 12.)

7. Select despatches relating to the formation of the Third Coalition against France, 1804–1805. Edited by J. H. Rose. 1904.

8. The Presbyterian movement in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, as illustrated by the minute book of the Dedham classis, 1582–1589. Edited by R. G. Usher. 1905.

9. State trials of 1289–1290. Edited by T. F. Tout and Hilda Johnstone. 1906.

10. Collectanea Anglo-Premonstratensia. Vol. II. Edited by the Right Rev. F. A. Gasquet. 1906. (*See* nos. 6 and 12.)

11. The acts & ordinances of the Eastland Company preserved at York. Edited by Maud Sellers. 1906.

12. Collectanea Anglo-Premonstratensia. Vol. III. Edited by the Right Rev. F. A. Gasquet. 1906. (*See* nos. 6 and 10.)

13. The Camden miscellany, Vol. XI: 1. Some unpublished letters of Gilbert Burnet, the historian. Edited by Miss Helen C. Foxcroft. 2. Extracts from the papers of Thomas Woodcock, ob. 1695. Edited by G. C. Moore Smith. 3. The memoirs of Sir George Courthop, 1616–1685. Edited by Sophie C. Lomas. 4. The commonwealth charter of the city of Salisbury, [12] September, 1656. Edited by Hubert Hall, 1907.

14. The relation of Sydnam Poyntz, 1624–1636. Edited by the Rev. A. T. S. Goodrick. 1908.

†15. The diary of the Rev. Ralph Josselin, 1616–1683. Edited by E. Hockliffe. 1908.

16. Despatches from Paris, 1784–1789. Vol. I, 1784–1787. Edited by Oscar Browning. 1909. (*See* no. 19.)

17. The Bardon Papers: Documents relating to the imprisonment and trial of Mary, Queen of Scots. Edited by Conyers Read. 1909.

18. The Camden miscellany, Vol. XII: 1. Two London chronicles from the collection of John Stow. Edited by C. L. Kingsford. 2. Life of Sir John Digby, 1605–1645. Edited by Georges Bernard. 3. Iter bellicosum: Adam Wheeler, his account of 1685. Edited by H. E. Malden. 4. Common rights at Cottenham and Stretham in Cambridgeshire. Edited by W. Cunningham. 1910.

19. Despatches from Paris, 1784–1789. Vol. II, 1787–1789. Edited by Oscar Browning. 1910. (*See* no. 16.)

20. John of Gaunt's register, 1372–1376. Vol. I. Edited by S. Armitage-Smith. 1911. (*See* nos. 21, 56 and 57.)

21. John of Gaunt's register, 1372–1376. Vol. II. Edited by S. Armitage-Smith. 1911. (*See* nos. 20, 56 and 57.)

22. The official diary of Lieutenant-General Adam Williamson, Deputy-Lieutenant of the Tower of London, 1722–1747. Edited by J. C. Fox. 1912.

23. English merchants and the Spanish Inquisition in the Canaries. Edited by Leonora de Alberti and Annie B. Wallis Chapman. 1912.

24. The Essex papers, 1675–1677. Vol. II. Edited by the Rev. Clement E. Pike. 1913. (*See* New series, no. 47.)

25. The chronicle of Novgorod, 1016–1471. Translated and edited by R. Mitchell, N. Forbes and C. R. Beazley. 1914.

26. The official papers of Sir Nathaniel Bacon of Stiffkey, Norfolk, as Justice of the Peace, 1580–1620. Edited by W. H. Saunders. 1915. (*See* no. 52.)

27. Estate book of Henry de Bray of Harleston, Northants., *c.* 1289–1340. Edited by Dorothy Willis. 1916.

28. Autobiography of Thomas Raymond and memoirs of the family of Guise of Elmore, Glos. Edited by G. Davies. 1917.

*29. The Stonor letters and papers, 1290–1483. Vol. I. Edited by C. L. Kingsford. 1919. (*See* nos. 30 and 34.)

†30. The Stonor letters and papers, 1290–1483. Vol. II. Edited by C. L. Kingsford. 1919. (*See* nos. 29 and 34.)

31. The Nicholas papers. Vol. IV. 1657–1660. Edited by Sir G. F. Warner. 1920. (*See* New series, nos. 40, 50, 57.)
32. British diplomatic instructions, 1689–1789. Vol. I. Sweden, Part i, 1689–1727. Edited by J. F. Chance. 1922.
33. Parliamentary papers of John Robinson, 1774–1784. Edited by W. T. Laprade. 1922.
34. The Camden miscellany, Vol. XIII: 1. Gesta Dunelmensia, A.D. MºCCCº. Edited by R. K. Richardson. 2. Supplementary Stonor letters and papers, 1314–1482. Edited by C. L. Kingsford. 3. Devereux papers with Richard Broughton's memoranda (1575–1601). Edited by H. E. Malden. 4. The voyages of Captain William Jackson, 1642–1645. Edited by V. T. Harlow. 5. The English conquest of Jamaica, 1655–1656. Edited by Irene A. Wright. 1924.
35. British diplomatic instructions, 1689–1789. Vol. II. France, Part i, 1689–1721. Edited by L. G. Wickham Legg. 1925.
36. British diplomatic instructions, 1689–1789. Vol. III. Denmark. Edited by J. F. Chance. 1926.
37. The Camden miscellany, Vol. XIV: 1. Plan of St. Domingo. Spanish narrative of Santo Domingo. Translated and edited by Irene A. Wright. 2. Embajada Española; An anonymous contemporary Spanish guide to diplomatic procedure in the last quarter of the 17th c. Translated and edited by the Rev. H. J. Chaytor. 3. The will of Peter de Aqua Blanca, Bishop of Hereford, 1268. Edited by the Rev. Canon C. Eveleigh Woodruff. 4. The ransom of John II, king of France, 1360–1370. Edited by Dorothy M. Broome. 5. Historia mirabilis parliamenti, 1386. Edited by May McKisack. 1926.
38. British diplomatic instructions, 1689–1789. Vol. IV. France, Part ii, 1721–1727. Edited by L. G. Wickham Legg. 1927. (*See* nos. 35, 43 and 49.)
39. British diplomatic instructions, 1689–1789. Vol. V. Sweden, Part ii, 1727–1789. Edited by J. F. Chance. 1928. (*See* no. 32.)
40. The *Vita Wulfstani* of William of Malmesbury. Edited by R. R. Darlington. 1928.
41. The Camden miscellany, Vol. XV: 1. A transcript of 'The Red Book' of the bishopric of Hereford, *c.* 1290. Edited by the Rev. Canon A. T. Bannister. 2. Edward II, the Lords Ordainers, and Piers Gaveston's jewels and horses, 1312–1313. Edited by R. A. Roberts. 3. Table of Canterbury archbishopric charters. Edited by Irene J. Churchill. 4. An early admiralty case, A.D. 1361. Edited by Charles Johnson. 5. Select tracts and table books relating to English weights and measures, 1100–1742. Edited by Hubert Hall and Frieda J. Nicholas. 6. An English prisoner in Paris during the Terror, 1793–1794. Edited by V. T. Harlow. 1929.
42. Notes of the debates in the House of Lords, officially taken by Robert Bowyer and Henry Elsing, Clerks of the Parliaments, 1621, 1625, 1628. Edited by Frances H. Relf. 1929. (*See* New series, no. 24.)
43. British diplomatic instructions, 1689–1789. Vol. VI. France, Part iii, 1727–1744. Edited by L. G. Wickham Legg. 1930. (*See* nos. 35, 38 and 49.)
44. Private correspondence of Chesterfield and Newcastle, 1744–1746. Edited by Sir Richard Lodge. 1930.
45. Documents illustrating the activities of the general and provincial chapters of the English Black Monks, 1215–1540. Vol. I. Edited by W. A. Pantin. 1931. (*See* nos. 47 and 54.)

46. British diplomatic representatives, 1689–1789. Edited by D. B. Horn. 1932. (*See* no. 50.)

47. Documents illustrating the activities of the general and provincial chapters of the English Black Monks, 1215–1540. Vol. II. Edited by W. A. Pantin. 1933. (*See* nos. 45 and 54.)

48. Diplomatic correspondence of Richard II. Edited by Edouard Perroy. 1933.

49. British diplomatic instructions, 1689–1789. Vol. VII. France, Part iv, 1745–1789. Edited by L. G. Wickham Legg. 1934. (*See* nos. 35, 38 and 43.)

50. British diplomatic representatives, 1789–1852. Edited by S. T. Bindoff, Elizabeth F. Malcolm Smith and C. K. Webster. 1934. (*See* no. 46.)

51. Rotuli parliamentorum Anglie hactenus inediti, 1279–1373. Edited by H. G. Richardson and G. O. Sayles. 1935.

52. Camden miscellany, Vol. XVI: 1. The state of England (1600). By Sir Thomas Wilson. Edited by F. J. Fisher. 2. Discours of the Turkes. By Sir Thomas Sherley (1606–1607). Edited by Sir E. Denison Ross. 3. Relation of a short survey of the western counties of England, 1635. Edited by L. G. Wickham Legg. 4. Supplementary Stiffkey papers, 1578–1620. Edited by F. W. Brooks. 5. Probate inventory of Sir John Eliot, late prisoner in the Tower, 1633. Edited by H. Hulme. 1936. (*See* no. 26.)

53. Robert Loder's farm accounts, 1610–1620. Edited by G. E. Fussell. 1936.

54. Documents illustrating the activities of the general and provincial chapters of the English Black Monks, 1215–1540. Vol. III. Edited by W. A. Pantin. 1937. (*See* nos. 45 and 47.)

55. Memorials of the Holles family, 1493–1650. By Gervase Holles. Edited by A. C. Wood. 1937.

56. John of Gaunt's register, 1379–1383. Vol. I. Edited by Eleanor Lodge and R. Somerville. 1937. (*See* nos. 20, 21 and 57.)

57. John of Gaunt's register, 1379–1383. Vol. II. Edited by Eleanor Lodge and R. Somerville. 1937. (*See* nos. 20, 21 and 56.)

58. Early charters of the cathedral church of St. Paul, London. Edited by Marion Gibbs. 1939.

59. The formation of Canning's ministry, February to August 1827. Edited by A. Aspinall. 1938.

60. The correspondence of Lord Aberdeen and Princess Lieven, 1832–1854. Vol. I, 1832–1848. Edited by E. Jones Parry. 1938. (*See* no. 62.)

61. The letters of Arnulf of Lisieux. Edited by F. Barlow. 1939.

62. The correspondence of Lord Aberdeen and Princess Lieven, 1832–1854. Vol. II, 1848–1854. Edited by E. Jones Parry. 1939. (*See* no. 60.)

*63. British Consular reports on the trade and politics of Latin America, 1824–1826. Edited by R. A. Humphreys. 1940.

64. Camden miscellany, Vol. XVII: 1. Ely chapter ordinances and visitation records, 1241–1515. Edited by Seiriol A. J. Evans. 2. Mr. Harrie Cavendish, his journey to and from Constantinople, 1589. By Fox, his servant. Edited by A. C. Wood. 3. Sir John Eliot and the vice-admiralty of Devon. Edited by Harold Hulme. 1940.

65. Correspondence of Charles Arbuthnot. Edited by A. Aspinall. 1941.

66. Ministers' accounts of the earldom of Cornwall, 1296–1297. Vol. I. Edited by L. Margaret Midgley. 1942.

67. The notebook of John Penry, 1593. Edited by Albert Peel. 1944.

68. Ministers' accounts of the earldom of Cornwall, 1296–1297. Vol. II. Edited by L. Margaret Midgley. 1945. (*See* no. 66.)

69. The letter-book of John Viscount Mordaunt, 1658–1660. Edited by Mary Coate. 1945.

70. The Gascon Calendar of 1322. Edited by G. P. Cuttino. 1949.

71. Cartulary of St. Mary Clerkenwell. Edited by W. O. Hassall. 1949.

72. Encomium Emmae Reginae. Edited by Alistair Campbell. 1949.

73. Select documents of the English lands of the abbey of Bec. Edited by Marjorie Chibnall. 1951.

74. The Anglica Historia of Polydore Vergil, A.D. 1485–1537. Edited by Denys Hay. 1950. (*See* Old Series, nos. 29 and 36.)

75. The correspondence of David Scott, Director and Chairman of the East India Company, relating to Indian affairs (1787–1805). Vol. I. Edited by C. H. Philips. 1951.

76. The correspondence of David Scott, Director and Chairman of the East India Company, relating to Indian affairs (1787–1805). Vol. II. Edited by C. H. Philips. 1951.

77. The private correspondence of Lord Macartney, Governor of Madras (1781–85). Edited by C. Collin Davies. 1950.

78. The despatches of Sir Robert Sutton, Ambassador in Constantinople (1710–1714). Edited by Akdes Nimet Kurat. 1953.

79. Camden miscellany, Vol. XVIII: 1. The Benares diary of Warren Hastings. Edited by C. C. Davies. 2. Some letters of the Duke of Wellington to his brother William Wellesley-Pole. Edited by Sir Charles K. Webster. 3. The Restoration visitation of the University of Oxford and its colleges. Edited by F. J. Varley. 1948.

80. Camden miscellany, Vol. XIX: 1. Some documents relating to the fulfilment and interpretation of the Treaty of Bretigny (1361–1369). Edited by P. Chaplais. 2. The Anglo-French negotiations at Bruges, 1374–1377. Edited by E. M. J. Perroy. 1952.

81. The political correspondence of Mr. Gladstone and Lord Granville, 1868–1876. Vol. I, 1868–71. Edited by Agatha Ramm. 1952.

82. The political correspondence of Mr. Gladstone and Lord Granville, 1868–1876. Vol. II, 1871–76. Edited by Agatha Ramm. 1952.

83. Camden miscellany, Vol. XX: 1. A briefe collection of the Queenes Majesties most high and most honourable Courtes of Recordes. By R. Robinson. Edited by R. L. Rickard. 2. The Hastings journal of the parliament of 1621. Edited by Lady de Villiers. 3. The minute book of James Courthope. Edited by Orlo Cyprian Williams. 1953.

84. The kalendar of Abbot Samson of Bury St. Edmunds and related documents. Edited by R. H. C. Davis. 1954.

85. The sermons of Thomas Brinton, Bishop of Rochester (1373–1389). Vol. I. Edited by Sister Mary Aquinas Devlin. 1954.

86. The sermons of Thomas Brinton, Bishop of Rochester (1373–1389). Vol. II. Edited by Sister Mary Aquinas Devlin. 1954.

87. The War of Saint-Sardos (1323–1325). Gascon correspondence and diplomatic documents. Edited by Pierre Chaplais. 1954.

88. The cartulary of the Priory of St. Gregory, Canterbury. Edited by Audrey M. Woodcock. 1956.
89. The chronicle of Walter of Guisborough. Edited by H. Rothwell. 1958.
90. Camden miscellany, Vol. XXI: 1. The chronicle attributed to John of Wallingford. Edited by Richard Vaughan. 2. A journal of events during the Gladstone ministry, 1868–74, by John, first Earl of Kimberley. Edited by Ethel Drus. 1958.

Provisionally accepted for future publication:

British diplomatic representatives, 1509–1688. (*See* nos. 46 and 50.)

Historia Roffensis, 1315–1350. Edited by H. G. Richardson.

Liber Eliensis, books I, II and III. Edited by Dr. E. O. Blake.

Collected correspondence of G. R. Weckherlin. Edited by Professor L. W. Forster.

The diary of Thomas Rugge, 1659–61. Edited by Professor W. L. Sachse.

Letters from the English abbots to the chapter at Cîteaux, 1442–1521. Edited by Dr. C. H. Talbot.

The Wentworth papers, 1596–1628. Edited by J. P. Cooper.

The account book of Beaulieu Abbey. Edited by Dr. C. H. Talbot.

The parliamentary diary of Sir Edward Knatchbull. Edited by A. N. Newman.

The writs and letters of Walter de Wenlok, abbot of Westminster, 1283–1307. Edited by Barbara Harvey.

36 indentures of general retinue service between John of Gaunt and various knights and squires, 1367 to 1396. Edited by Dr. N. B. Lewis.

Earldom of Hereford Charters. Edited by Dr. D. Walker.

Parliament and Council proceedings, Edward I–Edward III. Edited by Dr. Patricia M. Barnes.

SHL
WITHDRAWN
BIBL.
LONDIN.
UNIV.

JR 10 NOV 1969

1977 -1